335

MY COUNTRY RIGHT OR WRONG

HERVÉ

3 1761 07351393 9

Presented to the

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

by the

ONTARIO LEGISLATIVE
LIBRARY

1980

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/mycountryrightor00herv

My Country, Right or Wrong.

29624

My Country, Right or Wrong

By

Gustave Hervé

Barrister-at-Law.

Translated from the French

By

Guy Bowman.

With Three Illustrations.

London:

A. C. Fifield, 13, Clifford's Inn, E.C.

1910.

LIBRARY
FEB
2
1982
OF TORONTO

HX
545
H 57813

DEDICATION.

To the veteran of the International Peace Movement,

FELIX MOSCHELES

this translation of Gustave Herve's classic work is dedicated in token of respect and admiration of lifelong devotion to the cause of anti-patriotism.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE BY E. BELFORT BAX 1

INTRODUCTION 5

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE 15

AUTHOR'S PREFACE 19

CHAPTER I. 23
The French Country.

CHAPTER II. 31
Almost all Countries are alike.

CHAPTER III. 41
The miracle of patriotism.

CHAPTER IV. 47
Patriotic education in the family.

CHAPTER V.... 50
The patriotic song at school.

CHAPTER VI. 58
The patriotic teaching at school.

CHAPTER VII. 68
The patriotic lies ; the classic definitions of the Country.

CHAPTER VIII. 75
The French patriotic prejudices ; the French are the first soldiers in the world.

CHAPTER IX. 80
The French patriotic prejudices : France is the country of chivalrous generosity.

PAGE

CHAPTER X.... 84

The French patriotic prejudices: France the classical land of revolution and of liberty.

CHAPTER XI. 88

Patriotism a religion: The worship of the flag.

CHAPTER XII. 93

Why the leading classes preach patriotism to the people: Patriotism—the upholder of the capitalist system.

CHAPTER XIII. 101

Why the ruling classes preach patriotism to the people: The little profits of foreign wars.

CHAPTER XIV. 113

The Internationalism of patriot Socialists.

CHAPTER XV. 127

Inconsistency and dangers of patriot Internationalism.

CHAPTER XVI. 134

The anti-patriot Socialists.

CHAPTER XVII. 144

The anti-patriot Socialists and the question of citizen armies.

CHAPTER XVIII. 149

The refusal of military service in time of peace.

CHAPTER XIX. 156

In case of war.

CHAPTER XX. 160

The question of the attitude of Socialists in case of war at the Congress of Brussels (1891), and Zurich (1893).

CHAPTER XXI. 177

Their objections: Our conception is anarchistic.

PAGE

CHAPTER XXII. 182
Their objections: The countries will always live.

CHAPTER XXIII. 188
Their objections: Our conception is reactionary.

CHAPTER XXIV. 196
Their objections: Our project of military strike and insurrection is unrealisable.

CHAPTER XXV. 200
Their objections: The electoral reason.

CHAPTER XXVI. 206
The decisions of the International Congress of Brussels and Zurich do not bind us for ever.

CHAPTER XXVII. 210
The anti-patriotic propaganda in the working-class districts of France.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 218
Anti-patriotic propaganda among the Freneh rurals: The work of the "Pioupiou de l'Yonne."

CHAPTER XXIX. 235
The question will be put.

APPENDIX 247
Militarist and International conflicts before the International Socialist Congress, Stuttgart, 1907.

ILLUSTRATIONS—

GUSTAVE HERVE ... ... *to face page* 5
DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS ... ... ,, ,, 160
KARL LIEBKNECHT ... ... ,, ,, 248

PREFACE.

THE well-known work of Gustave Hervé appears now for the first time in an English dress. In no country more than in Great Britain is the noble protest of Hervé against that fraudulent counterfeit of a moral principle which is called in the present day patriotism, necessary. Time was not later than the eighteenth century, when the word patriotism connected the cause of the people against governments and against the oppressions of a privileged class; this was the sense in which the word was used till the time of the French Revolution. In the great manifesto in which the National Convention in 1792 called upon the peoples of Europe to make common cause with France against their oppressors, that is, to make common cause with an alien power against their own native ruling classes, the appeal was supposed to be made to their patriotism.

Some years before this, Dr. Johnson, in this country, is credited with a *mot* to the effect that patriotism is the last resort of scoundrels. Now, Dr. Johnson, the old Tory reactionary of the eighteenth century, would certainly not have said this of any but the popular agitator who was against the government of his day. The modern patriot,

who shouts at music-halls and elsewhere for every plundering raid undertaken by the government of his country on behalf of the financial capitalist would probably have been a man after Dr. Johnson's own heart. In this we may see how the meaning of the word patriotism has changed; it is against modern patriotism, the doctrine of "my country, right or wrong," that the polemic of Gustave Hervé is directed.

But, says the reader, let us return to the true sense of the word! No, says Hervé, the word itself is now defiled beyond redemption, worthy only to be devoted to the nether gods! Let all Socialists proclaim themselves in word what they should be in deed; if they carry their principles to their logical conclusion, let them declare themselves anti-patriots. And so say we!

Hervé's book is first and foremost a polemic against French jingoism or nationalism, as it is called; but the application of its reasoning to British Imperialism, and every other national sentiment, will be obvious to every intelligent reader. Those who are familiar with the name of Hervé will be probably inclined to dismiss anything written by him as the work of a fanatic and a dreamer of Utopian dreams. This book should suffice to disabuse them of their prejudices, derived as they are from the bourgeois press and from politicians, I am sorry to say, some of them belonging to the Socialist Party, who regard Hervé, with his logical consistency and his honest enthusiasm, as a marplot in the way of practical vote-catching. We trust and believe that the book will not fail to

make converts; not only to the views of Hervé anent anti-nationalism, but will help to further the creation of a body of opinion within the Socialist Party that vote-catching and electoral tactics are not the one thing needful in Socialism, but that the principles of Socialism for the sake of which the Party is supposed to exist, are something more than ballast to be thrown overboard in the first squall of contemporary politics.

The present translation will be found throughout to adequately represent the sense of Gustave Hervé's vigorous and trenchant French.

E. Belfort Bax.

GUSTAVE HERVÉ.

INTRODUCTION.

In inviting the attention of the British public to the following chapters, I think it will be useful first to introduce Hervé, their author. I will try to depict him *as he is*, although this is no easy task, for Gustave Hervé is, of all men, one whose character and doings have been wickedly misrepresented. During the last few years a furious storm of invective and calumny has been showered down upon his head: there are no malignant suspicions, no treacherous insinuations, no grotesque accusations, that have not been lavished upon him. He has accumulated against himself all manner of hatred and rancour; for, despite these malicious attentions of his enemies, he possesses the obstinate skull of the Breton, and proceeds heedless on the path he has mapped out for himself. He has troubled peaceful digestions, stirred up stagnant waters and revealed the filth they concealed, and upset skilful combinations. He has compelled some to declare themselves, others to hold their peace; he has forced many to think. He has put embarrassing questions with the boldness which is so distinctive of his character, questions which others scarcely dared touch upon, content to confide their solution to the more and more remote future.

He has been beaten from pillar to post by one party and another, who have, when it served their purpose, made him a scapegoat, after having endowed him with infamy and covered him with shame. It seems, indeed, almost impossible at first sight to persuade the good public that Hervé sets us a shining example of a life of toil, patience and self-denial.

Hervé is a native of Brest, the well-known French naval base of Brittany. He is a headstrong, obstinate Breton, a fact which explains his stubbornness against allowing himself to be repressed, either by his Socialist friends or by his learned brothers, the barristers. He was born on January 1st, 1871. The father of the future antimilitarist was almost a military personage, for he worked in the harbour as a marine-master, holding an appointment which a Hervé had occupied, father and son, for many generations. On the mother's side his ancestors were farmers, peasants from Brittany. His grandfather, who was a *pavillonneur*, or flagmaker, in the harbour works, made scores of those flags which his grandson was one day to plant in the muck-heap. The family was poor, and there were four children, the eldest, Gustave, being ten years of age when his father died. He was brought up by his mother, a strong, intelligent and energetic woman, such as are too scarce nowadays, and he attended the town school, which would correspond to what is known in England as the board school. Here he showed some ability, and a neighbour took an interest in him, encouraging him to obtain a scholarship, which carried

him on to a lycée.* Already Hervé began to show his colours—the revolutionary element was already in him and struggling to come out. Wilful and impatient of discipline, he was regularly kept in on Sundays; yet, in spite of all this, he set forward fairly peacefully and diligently with his studies, and at last reached his eighteenth year, and became a bachelor of arts.

From the outset life was not clement to him. He became an usher in a State lycée, with a salary of 55 francs a month, of which he sent 40 francs to his mother. This lasted two years, at the end of which period he was nominated to a professorship in history, but, on the ground that he was a suspect, he was dismissed, and returned to his profession as usher. During that time, alone and stubborn, *without following any course of tuition*, and with that dogged obstinacy which forms the basis of his character, Gustave Hervé worked hard, and in less than three years became a master of arts, whereupon he was sent as professor to Rodez, in the department of l'Aveyron, in the South of France.

At Rodez he began his political career, and the time was the beginning of the Dreyfus affair in 1897. Without waiting for Zola's "J'accuse,"* he published a sensational letter. As he was the

* Lycée, a State school, corresponding to our public or grammar schools.

* "J'accuse," the title of the epoch-making article in the Radical paper *l'Aurore*, by Emile Zola, in which he accused the generals of the French Army with having sentenced Dreyfus, well knowing him to be innocent.

only Dreyfusard in the town, the Catholics organised a cabal against him, and forced him to leave the place. He came to a temporary anchorage at Alençon, a small Norman town; but his reputation as a revolutionary made his life difficult until, fortunately, he succeeded in exchanging posts with the professor of history at Sens, in Burgundy.

As professor, Hervé never met with trouble; in his teaching he was careful to keep outside politics. But in private, after class-time, politics were more and more taking hold of the man, to his complete transformation. The benevolent and smiling professor became a terrible fighter, preaching the destruction of class-privilege, the abolition of capitalism, and the suppression of property.

In April, 1900, the *Federation de l'Yonne** founded the *Travailleur Socialiste* newspaper, and commenced a vigorous anti-militarist campaign. Hervé's articles appeared under the nom de plume of "Un Sans-Patrie," or "A Countryless." One of them, entitled "Drapeau de Wagram," excited general indignation, and the Press made so much noise that the author was proceeded against by the Government. As a result, Hervé was committed to the assizes, and although he was acquitted the Minister of Education dismissed him from his post as a professor. (It may be pointed out here that his defender was a little-known Socialist barrister named Aristide Briand,

* Federation de l'Yonne. The French Socialist Party is composed of *groups* or *branches* linked up into *federations*, which generally correspond to the departments of the country; hence they bear the names of their *county* or departmental areas.

who has since disappeared from revolutionary circles and is now parading in other spheres, as one may see.)

Being now entirely free, Hervé devoted all his time to revolutionary propaganda. For four years he tramped the department of l'Yonne, sleeping with the peasants, to whom he had come in order to expound in simple language his Socialist and anti-militarist principles. It is during these tourings that his anti-patriotism orginated. It had been apparent to him for some time past that the Socialist Party was drifting more and more away from its old firm ground of revolution and, forgetting its origin, was becoming immersed in the slough of electoral opportunism. He watched it, as more and more it gave way to concessions, weak-kneed compromise and fatal deviations, and he realised that a party composed solely of subscribers and voters, and which is not animated with the spirit of revolution, cannot hope to be a party of great power and action. He himself, on the other hand, while steadily carrying on his propaganda, was conceiving the class-war more clearly and more acutely.

Meanwhile, the *Pioupiou de l'Yonne*, the new organ of the anti-militarists, had not escaped prosecution. In connection with this venture, Hervé was twice dragged into the assize courts, and each time acquitted.

But the real debut of Gustave Hervé on the political field was in 1905, the year of French Socialist unity, and the Moroccan affairs. Shortly after the International Socialist Congress at Am-

sterdam, a congress was convened in Paris of all the then existing Socialist parties in France, with the object of amalgamation. This object, as is well-known, was successfully attained, and to close the proceedings a great meeting was held at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall. Here Hervé rose to address the delegates, and with his well-known cunning tone and ironical smile he quietly declared, in the name of the peasants of l'Yonne, *that in case of war they would not march.*

Ah, but here was a nice row! The Socialist Party, represented by its great leaders, stood up indignant, and invective began to fly. They called him charlatan, madman, self-advertiser, mentally-diseased, neurotic, fool, even swindler. But Hervé is not so easily thwarted, and he coped with the storm. Besides, one must admit this fact: he was but the mouth-piece of the peasants. The doctrine of anti-patriotism, as it is known to-day, *or Herveism*, as it has been called, originated not in this one man's brain, but in the villages of l'Yonne. Hervé has but found the formulæ to express it and to present it to public opinion.

It is well known how rapidly events have succeeded one another since 1905. An anti-militarist manifesto to conscripts placarded all over Paris on the eve of their departure for barracks led to Hervé's prosecution, and he was sentenced to five years' imprisonment. He was, however, released after about six months, and soon after his re-appearance in public came the first number of *La Guerre Sociale*, Hervé's own paper. One morning it came out with a heading in large type: "DOWN

WITH THE REPUBLIC!" which scandalised the press and gave rise to a heated controversy. Then came the Congress of Nancy, where 41 federations cast their votes for his motion inviting reservist soldiers to strike and rise in insurrection on the outbreak of war. Immediately after came the International Congress of Stuggart,* where he plainly put the question to the Germans, tackling Bebel and Vollmar, and then on his return to France the coming into line of Jaurès.

In spite of all that restless agitation, in the midst of all that continuous turmoil, Hervé was working diligently and doggedly; he became a barrister-at-law, but not without a good deal of opposition from those gentlemen of the Bar who deemed him unworthy of admission into their ranks. Once at the bar, however, they had to admit his moderation and to appreciate the contrast between the barrister, a smiling good fellow, and the politician whom men were pleased to call an infuriate.

This notwithstanding, his stay at the Bar did not last very long, for the presence of a Hervé amongst men of order like barristers was not calculated to promote harmony; rather it made things uncomfortable for them. Called to the Paris Bar in 1906, he has just been expelled from it as a sequel to the last sentence of twelve months' imprisonment which was passed upon him by the Seine Assize Court for insulting the Army and the Government in his paper *La Guerre Sociale*.

---

* Particulars of the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart will be found at the end of this volume.

In private life he is a most agreeable man, remarkable for his never-failing good humour. One could not imagine a person less violent than Hervé, and when one sees him walking quietly and gently, with a measured step, and presenting a most inoffensive appearance, no one would imagine him to be the redoubtable head of a militant army, be it of anti-militarism!

A bachelor, he lives somewhat apart, modestly and easily satisfied. He has always remained on very good terms with his family; one of his brothers is a doctor at Saint-Nazaire, in Brittany, and another, by the irony of fate, a captain of artillery in the French Army, who, far from having severed his connection with his revolutionary brother, sent him a cheque for twelve pounds from Madagascar at the time when he was dismissed from his professorship.

This is the man upon whom the malignity of our time exercises itself. The much-abused man is simple of needs, without personal ambition, and he obstinately refuses candidatures and profits. His only care, after he shall have planted the flag one knows where, is to plant a few clear and precise ideas in the brains of his contemporaries. Deliberately he has assumed this painful role, and he plays it so naturally, with such a perfect good humour and constant optimism, that not the most violent attacks, menaces and prosecutions are capable of disconcerting him or of causing him to swerve from the path he has freely chosen for himself. Faced with the diplomacies, combinations and trickeries of politicians, he wears the assured

smile of the philosopher who can estimate men and things at their true value.

Men, who would appear to be devoted to stupidity until the end of the world, will ever fight and tear one another to pieces for *words*. Yesterday it was God, the King; to-day it is the Country; to-morrow it will be Humanity. What does it matter? Hervé knows it.

But whatever the future may hold for him, he will have had the rare satisfaction of forming solid and disinterested friendships, the fierce joy of raising implacable hatreds, and the glory of being the first apostle of the rejuvenescent Revolution.

GUY BOWMAN.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

In Gustave Hervé's book, much use is made of the term "la patrie," for which I find it difficult to secure an exact English equivalent.

I have therefore utilised the word "Country," by which I hope to convey the meaning of the French "patrie" or the German "Vaterland."

"Countries" should be taken, in the following pages, to mean those countries, as at present politically defined, in each of which there dwells a nation of people who regard it with patriotic affection and devotion.

The title of the book may appear somewhat puzzling, especially to those who do not understand what Socialists call the "class-war"; yet the whole spirit of the book is precisely concreted into its title. Our Italian friends, who have already translated this work into their own language, have entitled it: "La Patria di lor Signori" (Their Lordships' Country), but I have not followed their suggestion, for it does not yet exactly convey the idea of Hervé, who contends that capitalists (financiers, money-mongers, adventurers, etc.) alone have an interest in maintaining the existing Countries; therefore, he calls them "THEIR," not "OUR," Countries.

The word "reformism," which is not to be found in any English dictionary, is made use of in the following pages. I believe it is not so long ago since it was introduced into the French language by the Socialists, but its meaning is obvious: that which pertains to reforms. At Stuttgart I heard the Germans use the word "reformismus" freely, and the Italians also make use of the expression.

Moreover, it is good that Socialists all over the world should have common words to express ideas common to all of them.

I have no doubt the main arguments expressed in this book will meet with the approval of a great many Englishmen, and some of them will undoubtedly be eager to have them propagated throughout the land in order to destroy the jingoism which is still so prevalent amongst the masses of this country. They will be especially desirous of having them kept before the public in their application to current topics. If such is the case, I suggest the establishment of a new weekly anti-patriotic paper, similar to Hervé's own *La Guerre Sociale*, thus following the example of our Italian friends, who are starting *La Guerra Sociale* at Turin.

The Social War, as the new paper might be entitled, would contain the translation in extenso of Hervé's principal articles of general interest, and also the translations of those articles of our Continental or American comrades which are of interest to anti-patriots.

It might take some time to rouse a *real* revolutionary spirit in this country; but the Englishman,

seemingly so quiet and placid, carries under his mask of unconcern a very real and solid sense of right and justice. Once aroused, he pursues an unswerving path towards that he conceives to be right and just, a path from which he will not be turned by the strongest of arguments or circumstances. "Terrible is the wrath of the sheep," and the Englishman's bearing too often resembles that of placid *moutons*. Yet, once aroused, his temper and determination are only satisfied when the ultimate goal is reached.

I shall be very glad to receive and to answer any suggestions concerning the proposed undertaking.

GUY BOWMAN.

37A, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.
1909.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THIS book against the Country is not the work exclusively personal of an intellectual whom minor professional misfortunes might have embittered against society, or who would like to juggle with abstract ideas out of love for pure logic, or for the vain pleasure of maintaining paradoxes.

It is a true expression of the thought obtaining among an important group of schoolmasters, industrial workers, small shopkeepers, agricultural labourers, and small rural property owners, met in the course of three years of propaganda in the department of l'Yonne.

All of them have been patriots: there was a time when we would have given our lives for the Country, when we would have given our lives almost joyfully in order to retake Alsace-Lorraine.

And to-day, we are anti-patriots; but let us be thoroughly understood.

We do not at all pretend that love of the native village, steeple-patriotism as they call it—which is not at all national patriotism—is not a natural sentiment very firmly implanted in many people: we who hate the existing Countries have retained

for the little spot where we were born a kind of filial worship.

Neither have we ever maintained that there are not, throughout the existing nations, fairly noticeable differences of character and temperament such as have been caused by history.

We are convinced, as much as any patriot, that Countries have had their raison d'être at a time; and the best proof of it is that they were born and that they have lived; we even think that their existence, at certain periods and in certain circumstances, may have contributed to the general improvement of our species.

Finally, we perfectly understand that our fathers, the revolutionaries of '89 and '93, were patriots, and in their stead we would have been patriots just as much as they.

These consideration do not stand in the way of our proclaiming ourselves anti-patriots.

It is our full and complete adhesion to Socialism that has led us to that state of mind.

Patriotism groups men according to their land of origin, as decided by the vicissitudes of history; within every Country, thanks to the patriotic link, rich and poor unite against the foreigner.

Socialism groups men, poor against rich, class against class, without taking into account the differences of race and language, and over and above the frontiers traced by history.

Even between republican patriots, anti-militarists and pacificists like M. Clémenceau, and the International Socialists like ourselves, Socialism fixes a real gulf; the patriots of the republican bour-

geoisie attach a capital importance to the political constitution, whilst we, on the contrary, without denying the superiority of the republican over the monarchical form, consider the political differences as secondary when they cover similar economic forms.

Republicans like M. Clémenceau consider the existing political constitution of France as so superior to that of England or Germany, that they would fight tooth and nail to defend it, and with it the French genius which it shelters, and which is as its concrete expression.

We, on the contrary, will only fight to bring about (or to defend when we have got it) a social organisation superior to the others not only in its political form, but in the mode of production and distribution of wealth.

Therefore we will not fight to defend existing Countries; but we will fight when we need to bring about the Socialist régime, or to defend it as soon as we have succeeded in establishing it.

It follows therefrom that the republican patriots admit foreign war, but as a last resort, it is true to say, to defend the existing Country, whereas we admit one war only: the civil war, the social war, the class war, the only war which at the present time, in Twentieth Century Europe, might bring some real profit to the exploited of all countries.

The accusation so often levelled against us, that we find a malicious pleasure in formulating these brutally frank declarations, is unjust—we can and do feel how much they hurt respectable prejudices.

It matters very little to us that our anti-patriotic declarations may be used at forthcoming elections against the Socialist candidates, causing them to lose here and there a few votes; if Socialism wants to progress and to take firm root in the hearts of the masses, it must not rest content with being exclusively (or even chiefly) an electoral and Parliamentary party; at any rate, electoral considerations must not hinder the propaganda of integral Socialism.

That which grieves us much more is that we have to hurt the deepest feelings of a great many honest people to whom patriotism is a religion and a principle of morality.

After all, to found the secular society it has been necessary, and it is still every day necessary, to hurt religious prejudices as respectable as patriotism.

The old society is dying; a new one struggles to be born, and it is not our fault if the latter cannot emerge from the former's womb except by a painful and dolorous delivery.

GUSTAVE HERVÉ.

MY COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG.

CHAPTER I.

The French Country.

What is a Country?

For anybody who is not satisfied with words, for anybody who wants to forget for a moment the fantastic definitions of the Country which have been taught him at school, a Country is a group of men living under the same laws; because they themselves or their ancestors have been brought willingly or by force, more often by force, to obey the same sovereign, the same government.

Thus the French Country was constituted by the gathering of a great number of provinces, small or large, inherited, conquered or pilfered by the kings who preceded the Revolution

of 1789, or by the rulers who have succeeded them during the nineteenth century. One might say the same of all existing Countries.

All Countries have a common character: all, without exception, the French Country as well as the others, are composed of two classes—a minority of privileged and a majority of pariahs.

The number of privileged persons, like the mode of exploitation, may differ from one century to another, but at all times and in all countries a minority has lived at the expense of a majority who merely exist in want and ignorance.

Under the old régime in France the privileged comprised the kings, the landed, secular and ecclesiastical aristocracy, and later, if not by title, at least in fact, the aristocracy of money. By means of statute-work, titles, taxes of all kinds, direct or indirect, a million drones levied on the work of 20 million peasants, workmen and shopkeepers, enough to live in opulent idleness.

The Revolution of 1789-93 brushed aside these privileged few. Immediately a new class installed itself in their stead, more active, more intelligent, also more eager for profit, at any rate, more capable of making the labouring classes yield more.

After the gigantic net-catching of 1789-93 on national property, the new privileged class, in order to digest its new prey in peace, shielded itself behind the sword of Napoléon, it invaded the whole civil service, the Legislative Corps, the Council of State. Between 1815 and 1848 it reserved to itself alone, and to the debris of the old landed aristocracy, to whom it allied itself by mar-

riages, the right to vote: 90,000 voters from 1815 to 1830, 200,000 from 1830 to 1848.

Under the Empire, under the Restoration, under Louis-Philippe, it availed itself of its influence or of its seizure of the Government to make laws to its own advantage and to the detriment of the masses.

In conducted the mines and the railways under conditions onerous for the nation but profitable to itself and to those of its members who were able to engage in financial operations.

It instituted a fiscal system under which the rich do not pay in proportion to their fortune, in which the whole burden of taxes weighs on the shoulders of the poor, thanks to the iniquitous distribution of direct taxation and to the still greater iniquity of food taxes graduated the wrong way.

It authorises capitalists to form companies, but until 1864 forbade workmen, under penalty of the severest punishment, to combine for the defence of their earnings.

This privileged class created, to the detriment of the mass of tax-payers, salaries of 6,000, 8,000, 10,000, and 50,000 francs for high officials, almost all recruited from its own ranks, and it reserved starvation wages for road labourers, schoolmasters, and all small civil servants recruited from the common people.

It devised or gradually built up a costly legal procedure which puts justice within the reach of the rich alone.

Favoured by laws, favoured by the normal working of competition which, in a society where the

instruments of work are owned not collectively, but by private people, infallibly bringing about the crushing of small producers by the medium producers, of the medium producers by the large ones, the bourgeoisie during the whole of the nineteenth century strengthened its economic domination over the great mass of the nation: mines, railways, sugar refineries, flour mills, textile factories, huge stores, banks, large agricultural estates; it forestalled everything, levying enormous contributions on the small rural landowner, small shopkeeper, and the agricultural and industrial worker.

The "Bulletin de Statistique" of the Ministry of Finance has published a table of inheritances opened during the year 1902. It is suggestive.

Extent of net assets according to declarations.	Inheritances (1902). Numbers.	Proport. p. 1,000.	Taxed Amounts Million frs.	Values. Proport. p. 1,000.
Over 5 million francs ...	27	0.07	250.9	52
From—				
1 million to 5 millions...	381	1.05	714.2	150
500,000 frs. to 1 million	684	1.9	453.7	95
250,000 to 500,000 frs....	1,473	4.05	513.5	108
100,000 to 250,000 frs....	4,250	11.7	662.8	139
50,000 to 100,000 frs....	6,964	19.1	447.4	100
10,000 to 50,000 frs. ...	39,198	107.8	904.0	189
2,000 to 10,000 frs. ...	97,257	267.5	554.2	116
Under 2,000	213,378	586.8	241.5	51
Totals	363,612	1,000.0	4,772.2	1,000

This is the first table of the kind that was ever published in France, and the whole Socialist press has commented upon it at length.

No commentary could be clearer than that of M. Chanvin, in the *Européen* of November 7th, 1903:—

"What does one see in this little table?" writes M. Chanvian. "We see a social capital of 4 milliards, 772 millions (liabilities deducted) represented by 363,600 inheritances. Then, we see first at the top of the scale, 27 inheritances, the largest (more than 5 millions) representing 250 millions: at the bottom 213,000 inheritances, the smallest (less than 2,000 francs) representing only 241 millions: this shows that in the actual assessment of our public wealth, of 363,000 who died possessing fortunes the 213,000 smaller ones cannot counterbalance the 27 larger ones. This is but little: let us see further.

The average death-roll in France during the last five years was 800,000 a year. Let us deduct from this figure the approximate number of 40,000 children who died without having possessed or without having had the time to acquire money, and let us put on the one side of the scales the remaining number of 400,000 deceased whom the Treasury could not reach for the simple reason that their fortune was less than one franc.

Thus, of 760,000 deceased who have reached the age at which they can possess, we find 27 large capitalists, 27 idlers, 27 dead weights, provided their fortune most likely reproduces itself by the simple working of speculation, by the sole phenomenon of reproduction of money by money, who are economically, socially, vitally, incomparably more powerful than 213,000 workers whose daily labour amounts—after a life-time—to a capitalistic ralisation which is nil, or which is nothing if one will stop a moment to consider what an inheritance of less than 2,000 francs means.

So far, I have only put into the scales the two extreme concentrations of public wealth: the miserable and poor proletariat and the largest capitalists. This has enabled me better to emphasise the inequality of assessment and

show the social injustice in all its glaring truth. If I now introduce between these two opposite poles an intermediate element, that is to say, those classes comprising the inheritances which do not really represent capitalism but only the small bourgeoisie and the small peasant proprietors, I arrive at the following conclusion :

First, I agree with M. Jaurès, that the dividing line or line of demarcation between the capitalist minority and the majority which is not capitalist is somewhere at the level of 50,000 francs. In fact, above this limit, inheritances become very scarce. As against 349,000 inheritances in 1902 inferior to 50,000 francs, there are only 13,700 superior to 50,000 francs.

There, then, is really the dividing line.

Further, I see on the one side of this dividing line a body of 750,000 deceased, divided as follows in round figures : 40,000 who own nothing at all; 213,000 who possess almost nothing (less than 2,000 francs); 97,000 who possess more than 2,000 francs and less than 10,000 francs; and 39,000 who own more than 10,000 francs and less than 50,000 francs—this total of 750,000 persons possessing amongst all a round capital of 1 milliard, 398 millions. On the other side of the line is the small group of 13,700 capitalists, with a power of 3 milliards, 74 millions. Or, to put it in the form of a proportion, *one fifty-fourth* of the nation is almost *twice as powerful as the 53 fifty-fourths*—that is to say, of 38 million inhabitants, 650,000 capitalists weigh twice as much as the 35 and a-half millions who, after all, constitute the nation."

I do not know of a more striking and decisive illustration of social imperfection and of the injustice inherent in the existing economic régime.

But why all these figures? Why do we want statistics? To see both classes present in every country it suffices not to be blind.

The limit between the two classes may not be marked by frontier posts, and although there is

between rich and poor of every country an intermediate zone where the middle class evolves, everything, to the very language, to the dress, to the demeanour, in every Country betrays the juxtaposition, the superposition of a ruling class and an inferior class.

To the former go what are called the "liberal" professions, which are pleasanter, more highly thought of, more agreeable, and better paid than manual work. To them, in agriculture, commerce and industry falls the work of managing or inspecting, which flatters vanity, allows of leisure, brings about sometimes luxury and wealth, often large fortune; to them also is given sometimes the right to live upon their incomes from father to son, without working, without even diminishing their capital if their money is invested in enterprises that pay; to them, further, the intellectual joys, those of art and literature; to them, finally, the influential connections which often allow them when they have got themselves into a bad scrape to escape the rigours of penal law.

To the poor, to the crowds of lesser civil servants, small traders without credit, peasants without capital, the propertyless mass and the multitude of domestic servants of both sexes, falls the lot of ignorance, painful or loathsome toil, dangerous or unhealthy trades, long hours which make one disgusted with work, and drive men to drink and women even lower still. To them starvation wages or insignificant profits; to them the insecurity of the morrow, the rigours of the law at the slightest fault, and if illness, old age, or unemployment

comes, privations and dark misery with, especially for women, its procession of sorrows and shames.

That's what a Country is—a monstrous social inequality, the shameful exploitation of a nation by a privileged class!

CHAPTER II.

Almost All Countries are Alike.

All Countries are alike: or, rather, almost all Countries are alike.

The Countries which are decidedly inferior to the others, those in which even for the great majority of the population living is worse than anywhere else, are in Europe but exceptions, monstrosities on the road to oblivion.

They can be counted: in Europe, and at the doors of Europe, they are but two. One is Turkey, where the common people are impudently robbed by civil servants, and where the life of the humblest is not safe when the Albanians come down from their mountains into the plains of Macedonia, and when the Kurds throw themselves like wild beasts upon the Armenians.

The other is Holy Russia, where a whole race, the Jews, is outside the pale of the law, where men whose only crime is to be born Jews, are at the mercy of a crisis of religious hysteria as at Kichinew, the land *par excellence* of robbery and exacting administration, the land of the knout, of caviare, and of deportation by administrative power.

But of these two, the first, Turkey, only lives by the tolerance of the great European States, and German capitalism is transforming it economically; as for the other, the massacres of January 22nd at St. Petersburg, and the shaking produced by the Manchurian disasters, are heralds of its forthcoming transformation into an organised State like the great States of Western Europe.

Thus it can readily be affirmed that the only two Countries which in Twentieth-Century Europe represent a degree of civilisation really inferior to the others will not, ere long, be more or less inhabitable than the rest of European Countries.

As for the following: England, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the Scandinavian States, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary—and one may add the United States of America, China and Japan—they are all alike, or very nearly so. Certainly there are between them differences of governmental ticket; here the style is republican, there we find a royal sign, again, the chief of State is an emperor.

There are also real political differences: integral, universal suffrage does not yet exist in Europe except for the electors to the central Parliament in France, Switzerland and Germany; the parliamentary régime—that is to say, the right for the deputies to overthrow Ministries—exists fully only in France, in Switzerland, in England, in Italy, and in Belgium; it does not really exist in Germany, where the Emperor can maintain Ministries in power after they have been put in a minority at the Reichstag.

But these differences of government ticket and

of political forms are everywhere superficial, and quite secondary differences.

In such Countries as France, where universal suffrage and a parliamentary régime prevail, the legislative and executive power is, if not by right at least in fact, in the hands of the rich or well-to-do class, as in America, which is also a Country of universal suffrage and parliamentary régime, in England also, which enjoys the parliamentary régime but not quite universal suffrage, and again as in Germany, where there is universal suffrage without integral parliamentary régime.

To convince oneself of this, one has only to look at the composition of Parliaments, where in every Country one or two dozen peasants or manual workers sit in opposition to hundreds of lawyers, doctors, financiers, and large manufacturers; one has only to note that in France, after 33 years of republicanism, the proletariat is still awaiting, in 1905, a law on working men's pensions which the German proletariat has enjoyed for the last 20 years; that fiscal legislation is as favourable to the rich there as it is in Germany and England; that not only is the progressive income-tax still a dream, but that the major part of State resources is derived from food-taxes which are progressive in a downward direction; that the disproportion between the salaries of the lower civil servants is as glaring as it is in neighbouring Countries.

To-day, in 1905, we are approaching the separation of Church and State; but the separation which is about to take place hands over to the Churches immense property, and soon we shall see that no

more than in America, where the Church is free in a free State, will the separation in France sensibly diminish either its influence in the Country or its wealth, which the rich class will know how to maintain.

They boast to us of our liberty of the Press; but there is not one Country left, except Russia and Turkey, where it is possible for a Government to gag the Press. In Germany, where the crime of lèse-majesté still exists for those who speak irreverently of His Imperial Majesty, the Socialist papers do not refrain from attacking the very bases of society with the utmost vigour. In England, a monarchical Country, the Press is as free as in France, with this additional liberty that, among our neighbours on the other side of the channel the exceptional laws against the Anarchist press which have been in force since 1894 are there unknown.

As to our liberty of public meeting, which is great, we have less than in monarchical England, and only a little more than in Italy or Germany.

Finally, the right to combine into trade unions is no longer disputed anywhere, or, if it is, it does not at all prevent workers' coalitions and strikes: the laws most favourable to the workers' organisations do not, after all, prevent Governments, whatever they may be, republican or monarchical, from intimidating the strikers by formidable displays of police and troops, and from charging and even firing on them if need be.

In August, 1904, at Amsterdam, at the last International Socialist Congress, Jaurès, one of the leaders of the French Socialist Party, extolled the

policy of defending the Republic and republican action which he had followed in the past. He paraded his efforts and those of his friends to save the Republic from the assaults of clerical reaction.

Bebel, the principal leader of German Social-Democracy, answered him as follows:—

> It goes without saying that we are republicans, Socialist republicans. (Applause.) It is one of the gravest accusations thrown against us even to-day by Count Buelow, Prince Bismarck, and the whole German reaction. We have never denied it: but we do not exalt ourselves for the bourgeois republic.
>
> As much as we do envy you Frenchmen your Republic and desire it for ourselves, we shall, nevertheless, not have our heads knocked in for her: she is not worth it. (Thunder of bravos.) Bourgeois monarchy, bourgeois republic, one and the other are class States, both are necessarily by their nature made for maintaining the capitalist system. Both have to work with all their might for the bourgeoisie to keep all the power in legislation. For, the moment it lost political power it also would lose its economic and social status. A monarchy is not so bad, and a bourgeois republic is not so good as you make them out to be. (Lively applause.) Even in our Germany, land of militarism, of country squires, of bourgeoisie, we have institutions which for your bourgeois Republic are still an ideal. Look at the fiscal legislation of Prussia and other federal States, and look at that of France. I do not know of a Country in Europe which has a fiscal system so miserable, so reactionary, so exploiting as France. In face of that system of *sucking* with a budget of three and a half milliard francs, we have at least the progressive tax on income and fortune.
>
> And when it comes to realising the claims of the working class, the bourgeois Republic itself displays all its forces against the workers.
>
> Where could workers have been treated in a way

more brutal, more cynical, and viler than in the great Republic beyond the Ocean, which is the ideal of so many people?

Even in Switzerland, a Republic far more democratic than your France, in this short summer only the citizen army has been called out six times against the workers, who were making use of their right to combine and to associate, even in very small strikes.

I envy you your Republic, particularly for the universal suffrage applied to all elected bodies. . . . . But when in your Country workers and masters come into conflict the latter proceed in an odious fashion against the French proletarians. What is the army to-day, if not the best of instruments for the maintenance of class domination? There has been no struggle of any importance in the last four years, whether at Lille, Roubaix, Marseilles, Brest, or at La Martinique, and, quite recently, in Normandy against the glass-works strikers—(tumultuous applause)—where the Waldeck-Rousseau-Millerand Ministry, or the Combes Ministry, has not thrown the army against the workers. In November last, the Parisian police invaded the Bourse du Travail of Paris in a most shameful and violent manner, and wounded 70 workers.

(Analytical report of the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam, 14th to 20th August, 1904, published by the International Socialist Secretariat.)

Thus speaks Bebel, who knows the political situation of France well, and who has paid to know what German liberties are worth. He does not make a great difference, from a political point of view, between the French Republic and the German Empire; the applause which punctuated his reply, and particularly this part of his declarations, shows that his is not an exceptional opinion but the opinion of a considerable part of International Socialism.

Are the differences between Countries greater from the economic point of view? Not a bit!

Undoubtedly, English industry is infinitely richer than Italian industry; French agriculture is more prosperous than Spanish agriculture. Hence, too, the English and French capitalist classes are infinitely richer than the capitalist classes of Italy and Spain; nobody denies it.

But for the mass of the workers who, in one or the other Country, work like beasts of burden in order to satisfy the luxury of the rich, the situation is but little more enviable in one country than in another, and, after all, everywhere it tends to equalise itself.

The small shopkeeper, be he French, English, German or Italian, finds himself more and more crushed between the large stores and the co-operative societies. Stern competition makes more and more victims every year; the anxiety of having to pay bills worries him; he has the constant fear of suddenly seeing a new large store erected in front of him, and he finds it necessary to conceal his political or religious views for fear of offending the rich customers who pay well, and who are naturally conservative and reactionary.

Nowhere do small rural landowners succeed in defending their property against mortgage or seizure but by leading a life of privation, and at the price of a labour such as is practically slavery; and in all countries the most conservative parties are reduced to finding out means for preserving the home and small possessions of peasant families from seizure and mortgage.

Everywhere the badly paid agricultural labourers see themselves more and more obliged to leave the land for want of regular work, machinedom not leaving them more than three, four, or at the most six months of guaranteed work in the year.

Everywhere, finally, if one excepts those workers who possess a trade involving a long apprenticeship—those which the English call "skilled" workmen—the working classes of the towns, men and women, are reduced to low wages, long hours of employment, the uncertainty of the morrow, airless and lightless slums, adulterated food, a rudimentary education, and rough pleasures; in all capitals and in all large towns there are thousands of women reduced to selling their bodies in order to gain something to eat.

Of course, wages are not absolutely equal in all Countries. If we speak only of European Countries, the English workman earns generally a higher wage than the French workman of the same trade. But what advantage is that to the English worker, seeing that living is a little dearer in England, and rents higher? It being necessary to burn more coals and lamp-oil in that dark and damp climate and to take more substantial food than is necessary in the warmer countries.

Generally speaking, the average wages everywhere correspond very nearly to the indispensable minimum necessary to keep a workman alive and efficient for his labour.

Yet it must be observed that the Countries of advanced industry (which are not necessarily the

Countries providing the highest wages) are also those Countries where industrial crises are the most terrible, where the ever-progressing machinedom most often overthrows the world of toil, and where, consequently, the number of unemployed is proportionally highest.

Finally, do not let us forget that everywhere wages have a manifest tendency to become uniform. Thus a French manufacturer who finds workmanship too expensive in France carries part of his concern into Russian Poland; other French and English capitalists are developing Russian industry, and by this internationalism of capital, which knows no frontiers, the wages of the Russian proletariat have already begun to increase. At other times it is not capital that goes abroad to create or swell a foreign industry; it is the labourers of the poorer Countries who go abroad into the Countries of higher wages, where they compete and reduce wages to a relatively low level, to the greatest advantage of the capitalists of their new Country.

By these two channels, by the exodus of capital towards the Countries of low wages and the exodus of workmanship towards the Countries of high wages, the condition of the workers has a tendency to equalise itself from one end of the world to the other, over and above all frontiers.

Once again, there is no contention that the political-economic conditions are the same in all Countries. Such would be a paradox and a gross inexactitude.

But it is true (and there can be no doubt about

it) that apart from Turkey and Czarist Russia, two monstrosities on the way to oblivion, all Countries are alike to within a very little; particularly between the existing French, German, English, Italian Countries there is so little difference that if to-morrow by a magic stroke or by a general consent quite as magical, Frenchmen all became Germans (may M. Deroulède pardon me this sacrilegious hypothesis), or if (flattering supposition!) the Germans all became Frenchmen, after the fusion the rich of both Countries would still be rich, that is to say, be free to exploit their fellow creatures, free to live plentifully from the produce of the work of the wage-earners, and the mass of the miserable and wretched would continue, German and French, to exist in squalor and misery.

What is true, finally, is that neither is the French Country superior to the German, Italian or English Countries, nor are the English, Italian or German Countries superior to the French Country to such an extent that one or the other is worth getting killed for.

The difference between one and another is so slight for the great mass of their inhabitants that if the disinherited of those Countries had a little commonsense or heart not one would lift his little finger when the day came that he was called upon to assist them.

To be a Frenchman, an Englishman, a German or an Italian, what difference can it make to them —beasts of burden and pariahs?

CHAPTER III.

The Miracle of Patriotism.

There is nothing more natural, more logical, than that in every Country the rich should be patriots! Nobody would wonder at *their* fighting and getting killed occasionally for *their* Country. Yet, even so, in France, ever since the reign of Napoleon they have found means to avoid conscription. Until 1872 all the laws they passed authorised their sons to buy a substitute who, in time of war, went to have his skin pierced in his stead. When the bourgeoisie could no longer completely escape the barracks, it passed the law of 1872, which may be summed up as follows: Article first, that the sons of the people will go to the barracks for five years; article second, that the sons of the bourgeoisie, on payment of 1,500 francs and the passing of a small examination, will go one year only.

The military law of 1889, which replaced that of 1872, was quite as mild for them: three years for the sons of peasants, ten months for those who had the means of wearing out the seats of their breeches on the benches of grammar schools and universities to the age of 26.

And one knows with what enthusiasm they have recently greeted the military law of two year, which condemns them to wear the knapsack like "the comrades."

After all, their aversion for military service only proves that they do not like the barracks; it does not at all prove they do not love their Country.

The Country does enough for them; it provides them all with education, leisure, comfort, ease, and even luxury: they would be monsters of ingratitude if they did not love her.

But what confounds intelligence is that in all Countries, the beggars, the poverty-stricken, the disinherited, the over-worked beasts of burden, ill-fed, badly housed, badly clothed, badly educated as are the three-fourths of the inhabitants of every Country, march like one man, at the first call, whatever may be the cause of war.

People who would not take one step to render a service to their neighbours, workers like themselves, march hundreds of miles in order to get killed for the masters who sweat them.

And it ought not to be said that they go through fear of the gendarme. If the gendarme is necessary for a few in cases of mobilisation, the majority of the citizens in every Country march to death as to a duty, almost joyfully.

In July, 1870, millions of German peasants and working men were working in peace. Many of them knew little more than that there was a Country called France. Other beasts of burden sweated and toiled in France, many of whom ignored the existence of a Country called Germany.

All of a sudden the order for mobilisation went out from Paris and from Berlin. At the news that the German Country was attacked, the German people rose up like one man, rich as well as poor. At the news that the French ambassador had been "insulted" in Germany, the French people arose *en masse*, beggars and millionaires, without even waiting for their Government to secure a proof of that so-called insult.

The two peoples rushed upon one another like wild beasts: 300,000 men were slaughtered, and after the bloodshed, on both sides of the Rhine, the flocks took back their yoke, obliged to toil a little more, vanquished and vanquisher, to repair the ruin brought about by war, and to prepare new slaughters.

From one end of the earth to the other, it is the same patriotic folly with the peoples.

If, a year ago, you had asked most Japanese peasants or workers whom Japanese aristocracy holds under its hard domination, whether they knew anything about Russia and Manchuria, many of them would have looked at you with a puzzled air: Russia? Manchuria? They had never heard of those Countries.

If at the same moment you had asked the great mass of Russian moujiks, which autocracy is shearing to its skin, whether they knew Japan or Manchuria, they would have answered: We do not even know what they are.

They got the order for mobilisation, and immediately they left everything, their wives, their children. All that cannon-flesh was heaped up,

piled up in boats and waggons *en route* for Manchuria!

And as soon as they got out of their boats and their waggons, there were the two flocks rushing upon one another like madmen; with what fury all the papers told us each morning.

The correspondent of *Le Temps* (September 13th, 1904) says:—

> This morning I saw a soldier who had been pierced by three bullets . . . . ; his mouth half-open, waves of blood came up by moments, the burst lungs made the noise of an old forge-bellows. It reminded one of the last convulsions of a slaughtered beast! . . . . Sadness, horror and ugliness! War is nothing else. What I have seen of the war is an infinity of small, niggardly, annoying things, whole days passed in stinking refreshment-rooms amid thousands of flies; smells of rotten meat; waggons of heaped-up humanities; horses and men confused; camps aligned at distances out of sight amid dirt and filth, in the dust or the mud. . . . Then, on a day of battle, lines, masses advancing or falling back; and men, a lot of men, falling under shrapnel and bullets—one does not know where they come from, fired by one does not know who. . . . This is the real vision of war. Before this spectacle of dirt and death one gets an immense appetite for life, a mad desire to run away from this atrocious world where men kill one another.

The correspondent of the *Daily News* at Moscow communicates the following recital of Lieutenant Kuzminsky, who saw fire for the first time at the attack of Motion-Ling on July 17th:—

> I was a little to the rear. I could see the men falling backwards one over the other like a ginger-bread house. Suddenly by my side a soldier screamed out, made two leaps, and then, falling forward, impaled himself on

his bayonet. The man behind him continued to advance, and stepped on the arm of his comrade. Then for the first time I felt the desire to launch myself upon the enemy without caring what would happen. . . . . Our men jumped one after another into the trenches, and there they piled themselves up with the enemy. In the faint light of the morning, many soldiers on both sides shot down their comrades instead of their adversaries. At last we took the position. Then followed an odious massacre of the surviving Japanese who refused to surrender or disdained to run away.

Reuter's correspondent, who was present at the battle of Liao-Yang writes:—

When nearing the Russian trenches, Kuroki's Japanese met with few defences consisting of wires disposed upon the ground and charged with high-power electricity. . . . A Japanese battalion succeeded in penetrating into the trenches; then, having exhausted its ammunition, it sought to open a way back by means of the bayonet, but it was exterminated. . . . Bloodstained the soil everywhere.

The same ferocious rage prevails around Port Arthur:—

The flanks of the hill covered with dead and dying were overflown with blood. One single mine exterminated 500 Japanese. The spectacle was horrifying: the sky was suddenly illumined with a blood-red light, then there came a shower of stones and human limbs as if they had come from a crater. (*Le Journal*, August 25th.)

We are told by two Russian officers:—

Each time the Japanese came on our lines, horrible frays took place where the wounded fought until killed. . . . . Nobody was saved. Couples frantically entangled were found with their teeth in one another's necks and their fingers in one another's eyes, dead like that. . . . The environs of Port Arthur are nothing less than an

immense charnel house where thousands of corpses that cannot be picked up are rotting. The stench is so strong that the Russian soldiers are compelled to stop their nostrils with camphored plugs.

A dispatch from General Stoessel runs as follows:—

During the night of September 2nd a hostile column, which had come to destroy the chains, fell on the automatic mines, which exploded. Many men were blown into the air.

Some sailors of the Cesarewitch, who survived the battle of August 10th, say that:—

Admiral Witheft was exterminated by the shell that struck him. His corpse disappeared overboard; one of his legs only was picked up. It was an infernal scene that made the hair of many men turn grey.

By what aberration do the pariahs of the different Countries throw themselves so upon one another with cries of hatred, at the first bidding of their masters? How can the German, French, Russian, or Japanese workers and peasants be so stupid as not to see that their only enemies are those who in their own Country extort from them the best of the fruit of their labour and live luxuriously at their expense?

It is patriotism which accomplishes this miracle. Our grandsons will refuse to believe in that prodigy of imbecility loved of their ancestors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

CHAPTER IV.

Patriotic Education in the Family.

Take a man of average intelligence, who has had but slight education and that purely secular.

Tell him that the earth was created by a God, that this God created light the first day, but the sun not until the second day; that he made the first woman with a rib of the first man; that Jonah lived in a whale; that Joshua stopped the sun; that the Virgin Mary conceived through the operation of the Holy Ghost; that Jesus raised the dead; that He resuscitated himself three days after His death; and other marvellous stories. He will laugh at you, or he will ask himself if you have suddenly gone mad, or if you want to ridicule him.

But cultivate the same man from the cradle. Let his mother, when rocking him on her knees, teach him prayers, litanies, etc.; let her talk to him of the good Virgin, the good Jesus, Christmas, and the flames of hell; let her talk to him once, one hundred times, one thousand times, about it.

Let her deliver him at the age of seven—the age of reason according to the Church—into the hands of the priest; let the latter tell him, as

revealed truths, all the drolleries of the Bible, all the naive creations of an ignorant and credulous humanity.

Pepper the whole with theatrical ceremonies in half-dark naves which incline one to dreaming and ecstacy, add to it the perfumes of intoxicating incense, the moving music of the organ, and the gorgeous dress of the officiating priest.

If contrary influences do not arise early to react against this enveloping of the whole being, against this poisoning of the brain and of the senses, the patient is incurably afflicted. You can tell him all the marvels of the holy books; you can make him believe that a piece of unleavened bread made by the baker at the corner shop, after consecration by a priest, really becomes the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Even if he has become a great scholar, a corner of his brain will always remain obscure, closed to all light of reason. Do not discuss with him, your trouble will be lost. When one talks to him about religion, he does not discuss with his reason, he reasons with his sentiments.

The training of a patriot is the same operation. The child can scarcely walk when they give him leaden soldiers, cannon, cardboard forts, a drum, a trumpet, a rifle or a sword bigger than himself, for his Christmas-box. When they can afford it, they dress him up in a hussar or dragoon's uniform, with a nice helmet boasting a handsome mane. At the family table, he hears the old soldiers recall the memories of their old campaigns.

Wars were not scarce during the nineteenth

century. After those of the Revolution and the Empire, which for twenty years made Europe a vast camp stretching from Spain to Russia, there was not one family in Europe where there was not at least one soldier. Throughout Europe, every successive generation from 1815 onward has been regaled with recitals of the battles of the Empire.

Who of the generations grown up during the second Empire have not heard an uncle or a cousin tell of the great feats of Algeria, Crimea, Italy and Mexico? And we who have grown up under the third Republic, have we not heard recalled at the family table on each side of the Rhine memories of the war of 1870?

And what memories? Memories of thefts, violations, slaughters, arsons.

Naturally, when one hears the tale of the old soldier, it is always the enemy, the foreigner, who played the odious part.

The child hears all this frequently, and his mind receives from this home education an indelible impression. Before even going to school, the urchin already bears in his blood the hatred of the foreigner, national vanity, idolatry of the sword, mystical adoration of the Country. He is already a patriot.

CHAPTER V.

The Patriotic Song at School.

The patriot in embryo begins going to school. Patriotism is but a germ in his young brain as yet, but school will make short work of developing it.

The child cannot yet read; but he has some memory; he likes noise; he likes singing. Very well, then, let him sing with all his heart at the opening of school, during lessons, and when leaving the class-room.

Sing what? Of course, the Country—the Idol! Her—always Her!

M. Paul Deroulède, our great national bard, has created the fashion, or, at least, he created the model of the fashion:—

> Forward! the road is wide;
> The clarion sounds the charge,
> And the zouaves go a-singing;
> And up there on the hill,
> In the forest which crowns it,
> The Prussian is waiting.

You can see them, these brave Frenchmen;

they go off a-singing in the sunlight, singing bravely. Ha! Is that really the French bravery, the real French bravery?

Whilst the Prussian is there, treacherously ambushed in the forest, sheltered, lying in wait, watching his prey.

The master has his disciples, rivals worthy of himself. The two song-books mostly used in public schools, one by M. Marmontel and one by M. Augé, swarm with songs in which there is no question but of the Country, France, the Flag, the Revanche.

The sweet poet, Maurice Bouchor, who would be indignant if anybody called him a nationalist, has also contributed to patriotic literature. The following song, taken at random from a hundred others of quite as delicate a patriotism, is not by Deroulède, nor by François Coppée, but by Maurice Bouchor. It is entitled:

THE FRENCH SOLDIER.

Where are you going, soldier of France,
All equipped, ready for the fight,
Full of courage and hope;
Where are you going, little soldier?
—As it suits the Country!
I only want to follow the drum.
March always! (bis)
As we cross the woods and meadows
I dream of my love.
—Yes, but one loses one's good looks
When traversing the vast waves.
It is hard, too, when one walks along,
Rifle on shoulder and knapsack on back.

—Brother, it is hard, but the Tulipe*
When he is tired whistles a chorus,
No chagrin. (bis)
He has his water-bottle, he has his pipe:
He is a fellow who never gives in!
—You, who go with a smile on your lips,
Will you see this sweet Country again?
Fear the sun, the night, the fevers,
The man ambushed in the trees.
—Well, I am ready to suffer,
Even to leave yonder my body.
Glory to the Flag! (bis)
I would like to see France once again,
But to die bravely is good!

A new text-book of music for primary education has just been published under the direction of M. Charlot, Inspector-General of Public Instruction. M. Charlot is no more a nationalist than M. Bouchor, he is a patriot after the fashion of all Republican Radicals. In that collection three songs are devoted to hailing the Country, and it so happens that all three sing the glory of the sword. One bears for its title: "The Departure of the Class."†

Thou goest, conscript. Hurrah for the class!
A Frenchman never grows weary
Of loving and serving his Country.
Couldst thou be afraid? . . . No, thou smilest.
Go then, conscript. Hurrah for the class!

The second bears a significant title: "Stand up, for France!" It begins like this:

The Gauls, proud and triumphant,
Braved the heavens and the gale;

* Fanfan la Tulipe: A typical soldier of Napoleon.

† The Class: The recruits, the conscripts of any one year; for instance, the recruits of 1908 constitute "The 1908 class."

The great battles were their fêtes—
Are we not their children?

The third one is entitled, "My Regiment." It is the naïve glorification of swords, drums, plumes —everything the children like in the regiment that passes by.

The patriotic song is not a fashion exclusively French. Deroulède has rivals and masters in all neighbouring Countries.

It would be idle to gather here the patriotic songs that the little English, the little Germans, and the little Italians learn at school or in the family. Here, are, however, a few samples of German patriotic songs which the author of a school-book* has gathered to show the little French scholars to what extent they are hated on the other side of the Rhine:

THE HUSSARS.

In the battle, in the midst of dangers, nobody is more gay than the hussar; the cannons roar and explode like thunderbolts, blood lights the eye which sparkles as we throw ourselves into the mêlée.

"Forward!" they shout, and the Hussars, sword and pistol in hand, advance sneering at the storm!

They talk French to us—we do not understand them! Let us cut off their heads to make them shut up.

The Hussar marches forward, always forward; if the comrade by his side is hit, he does not care.

*Ch. Bigot. *Le Petit Francais.*

The body dissolves in the grave, but not the uniform, and the soul goes up triumphantly to Heaven.

Where is the Rhine?

Where is the Rhine?—it flows on German soil. Notice that, you Frenchmen, who understand nothing about geography. And if, by a misfortune, we had not been sleeping during centuries, you would not, you scoundrels, have disputed us the banks of our river.

To-day we are revenging the shames you have inflicted upon the German people. Our brave boys are on the road, and, sword in hand, they are going to clear our frontiers of Zouaves and Turcos.

For the German lands you have stolen are Alsace, Lorraine and Burgundy! O yes; laugh! Go on, laugh! Soon your teeth will chatter with fright!

We shall take back from you those three provinces; we shall tear them from your claws! We shall re-establish German honour at the cost of French glory, and we shall establish ourselves as masters on both sides of the Rhine.

Our David.

M. Goliath, the French Philistine, steps forward and calls out to us: "Come, proud David, come! Approach a little! I am encased in armour from head to foot! Come and try your sling against me. You will not like it this time!"

And young David does not lend a deaf ear; he

comes up hurriedly with his sling and a good sword.

"Boaster, you who stand six feet, I am going to show you what I can do." And suddenly he grows and becomes a formidable giant. And he beats the ground with his foot, and from that ground an army of Davids arise, all giants like himself.

The sword mows the Philistines like the scythe which brings down the harvest on the ground. One sees at last the strength of that German David, our good Michael, so long scoffed at.

So the straw is scattered, so the grain is thrown on the ground, so the red ears of the mown corn cover the soil.

M. Goliath sees all this, and would like to be off, but David does not allow him time for it. He goes to him, takes him by the waist, uplifts him, balances him, and throws him far away across the fields.

"You have got your due, brawler! You have got yours, Philistines! If you so much as move but one step towards us, look out! We shall meet you once more, and fight to a finish, shameless marauders that you are. We shall upset the insolent walls of your Ascalon.

"We shall wipe your cities from the earth, and nobody will ever be able to recognise where Ascalon —Paris—once existed and where the French once lived!"

About the French.

You know the old song: "Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah!" We sang that chorus during the long

marches, we young men, when practising for the future war. "Hurrah! hurrah!" We sang that chorus in time of peace; to-day let us sing it again, for there is going to be fighting. Hurrah! then, and let us fall upon the French!

The old soldiers taught us this song: Hurrah! We are well worth the old ones, I imagine! Let us show it, hurrah! They sang so at Katzbach, at Grossbeeren, at Dennewitz, and whilst singing they fell like a thunderbolt on the French!

God bless you, old ones! Hurrah! We sing like you, after the old fashion, which is the good fashion, hurrah! And we have already proved it, for we also, at Wissembourg, at Forbach, and at Woerth, have been falling on the French.

My dear Mr. Frenchman, how are you? Hurrah! Shall you keep quiet and good this time, ha! Hurrah! Whatever you do, braving, defying, deceiving, lying, the devil! you will soon have enough of it. Forward, then! Let us fall upon the French!

Hail, King William, pious and strong hero! Hurrah! Thy entire people acclaim thee! Hurrah! Look at us well, and you will see whether we will beat the French.

Forward! Forward! Let us begin the dance again. Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah! To Paris! Paris is our aim! Our fathers have already been there twice. In our turn we will soon be there. Victory! Let us sing the old chorus: Hurrah! and let us fall upon the French.

Where is the child's brain, French or German, that would resist such a suggestion, this systematic

glorification of its Country, these unhealthy excitations against the neighbouring Countries? He scarcely can read, he knows little of anything: he knows, however, one thing, which is profoundly imbued in him—that he must be ready to sacrifice his life if his Country orders him to do so.

To die for one's Country
Is the finest lot, (bis)
The one most worthy of envy. (bis)

CHAPTER VI.

The Patriotic Teaching at School.

The young patriot learns to write, and they put "good" text books into his hands. All scholastic text-books are "good" text-books in Germany as well as in France; in Germany, as in France, and, indeed, as everywhere else, a "Congregation of the Index"* stands at the doors of the school, especially the primary school, to bar the "bad" text-books, those which might awaken in children a sense of criticism and free investigation.

The "good" text-book, French or German, is to be recognised at first sight by its engravings. Here is the *Nouvelle lère année d'histoire de France*, by M. Ernest Lavisse, of the French Academy. It is not necessary to read it; it is quite sufficient to turn over the leaves; of course it is a good text-book, as one may judge from the illustrations!

Here, Jean-le-Bon sabres the English at Poitiers. There, Chevalier Bayard puts to flight

* The committee which, at the Vatican, censures all new literature.

some horsemen, whom he pursued with such heat that he followed them into the hostile town, where he was made a prisoner.

Further, François I. sleeps on the frame of a cannon on the eve of the battle of Marignan.

You would not like M. Lavisse to have forgotten to show us Bayard at the Carigliano Bridge, Charles VIII. displaying his "French fury" at Fornovo, or Henry IV. sporting his white plume at the battle of Ivry, or the same Henry IV. sabring the enemy at the battle of Fontaine-Française; the Duc d'Enghien at Rocroy, or Tourville, who died in the service of the king, and the death of the heroic Montcalm in Canada.

M. Lavisse forgets to show us the sailors of the "Vengeur"* being swallowed up, as the legend tells us, with shouts of: "Long live the Republic!"

The historian is undoubtedly still hypnotised by Napoleon-thè-Great. Here he is at the siege of Toulon; there he is at the bridge of Arcole; admire him being enthroned at Erfurth in the middle of a ring of kings; pity him—the vulture encaged at St. Helena.

And M. Lavisse does not make us a present either of Marengo (after the picture by Carle Vernet), or of the retreat from Russia, where Field-Marshal Ney handles a rifle like a simple Grenadier, or of the taking of Saragossa, or the

---

* Le Vengeur, a ship in the Navy of the 1st Republic, which in a fight with the English fleet near Brest sank itself with its crew rather than surrender.

battle of Leipzig, or the defence of Paris (after Horace Vernet), still less of Cambronne at Waterloo.

The book terminates with a page of pictures in which we can admire the battle of Sidi-Brahim, MacMahon at Malakoff, the storming of Raischoffen, and even the bombardment of Foochow.

By the side of the heroic exploits of the French are portrayed the horrors committed by the foreigners. In this same volume of M. Lavisse one sees an engraving showing natives being burnt alive. Underneath, as an explanation: Conquest of America (cruelty of the Spaniards).

In the text-books for higher classes by the same author, the English are fastening the rebel Hindoos to the mouths of their cannon; but you would search in vain in that good text-book for an engraving showing the French be-smoking the Arab tribes in the grots of Dahra during the heroic times of the Algerian war.

The exposition of history is similar in character to the engravings. Father Loriquet,* whose pedagogical proceedings are so much laughed at by the anti-Clerical patriots, lied for the glory of God and the King. The patriotic Loriquets, in all countries, lie for the glory of the Country.

The proceeding is the same in all Countries. It consists, when relating the events of the past, in

* Father Loriquet, a famous Jesuit priest, who taught history after his own fashion, and whose least concern was accuracy. This way of teaching has become proverbial, and when one wants to express the idea of a tale being but remotely connected with truth, one says: "Tell a tale after the fashion of Father Loriquet."

putting to the fore the misdeeds of the other nations, and leaving discreetly in the background the wrongdoings of their own countrymen. If the Country is victorious, they triumphantly emphasise her victory; if she is beaten, they always find honourable reasons to explain her defeat.

It is an accepted axiom in France that the French cannot be vanquished except by treachery, by superior numbers, or by the ineptitude of their commanders: even when they capitulate by 80,000 at a time, as at Sedan, or in herds of 180,000, as at Metz, they are always lions, lions . . . lead by asses.

The writers of text-books in France have at last found out (it took them a long time!) that Bayard, Turenne, Condé, Napoleon and Marshal Bugeaud were not the only glories of France; that Rabelais, Molière, Voltaire, Michelet, Hugo, Lavoisier and Pasteur were perhaps as greatly to be honoured in the Country where they first saw light.

But as they took good care not to teach too plainly, at least in the primary schools, that the Countries of Michael Angelo and Raphael, of Goethe, Beethoven and Wagner, and of Shakespeare, Newton and Stephenson had also contributed a little to the progress of general civilisation, that discovery has only served to exalt the French Country and to belittle in the minds of the young patriots those foreign Countries whose glories are systematically left in the dark.

If history—impartial history—lends itself to this adulteration, one cannot wonder that civic

education, whose proper mission it is to make patriots, resorts to the most shameless lies, to the most basely heinous excitations in order to compass its ends.

In 1903, *La Petite Republique*, a paper that styles itself Socialist, held a competition on the books used in the public primary schools. The winner of that competition, M. Antonin Franchet, one of the most liberal and cultivated minds in matters of primary education, published his memorandum in the form of a small pamphlet, "Le Bon Dieu laique,"* which contains numerous quotations taken from the text-books mostly used at the present time in the primary public schools.

Those extracted from the text-books of civic education in current use are particularly edifying. Here are a few of them, for curiosity's sake.

Le Petit Français, par CH. BIGOT (p. 140) :—

If there were in our Europe a court constituted for judging differences between peoples, as there are courts to judge trials between individuals, you could, confident in the justice of your cause, take it before that court, content to entrust your interests to a good barrister But that does not exist, my child. There is no international court of justice in Europe and, if one existed, it would not be equitable, for the judges would not be impartial. They would judge the cases, not according to justice but according to their own interests and ambitions. . . .

To put a stop to it (war) all peoples ought to be just, or the respect of justice should be imposed on them by a superior arbitrator. That beautiful day will not dawn so soon, and how simple you would be, my child, and

---

* Le Bon Dieu laique: The lay God.

how predestinate to be taken like a sheep to the slaughter, if for one single moment you supposed that that day has come.

P. 170.—The moral greatness of war—

It (war) prevents peoples from becoming corrupt and satisfied with luxury and pleasure as an object in life. It teaches best how to despise danger, to be valiant and strong. . . . Peace is for all nations an awful trial; through it one grows soft, through it one grows to love comfort and wealth, one gets very near to losing one's force and energy and to leaving to others the advantage in the eternal struggle for life. But there comes war like a salutary storm! It warns in time of the perils one is incurring; it commands effort; it compels one to suddenly recover the manly virtues which one was losing. . . . It re-dips the nations in a bloody bath. . . .

P. 171.—If war had not existed, surely we would never have known how noble and heroic our species are. It makes individuals stronger, more generous. It has written with blood the golden book of humanity.

M. de Moltke spoke no better!

Manuel d'education morale, par A. BURDEAU :—

P. 95.—"Who else must we love?"

"We must love all men, even those who are not French."

"Can we love the Germans?"

"Those who have injured France, those who oppress the French of Alsace-Lorraine—we cannot think of loving them!"

L'Instruction civique a l'Ecole, par PAUL BERT.

P. 83.—Always remember the words of your old teacher: "No hatred amongst Frenchmen; keep it for the enemy!"

Première année d'instruction civique et morale, par P. LALOI :—

P. 171.—"Finished," said one of us, "finished for ever. There is France sunk into the abyss. How many defeats? What a humiliation. . . . . We shall never raise our heads again!"

A silence of a few minutes followed these words; but a young man called out: "I am twenty, and I shall see the regeneration of the Country." Then he spoke with a strong voice full of emotion: "Well, I tell you that France of the nineteenth century will rise again like that of the fourteenth. I tell you that if those sauerkraut-eaters, those bombarders of towns remain encamped after peace in some of our provinces, the day will come—late, perhaps, but it will come—when there will remain nothing of them in France but those who sleep underneath the earth."

Our young friend had restored hope to our hearts.

La morale mise à la portée des enfants, par O. PAVETTE:—

P. 124.—"One owes his Country the sacrifice of one's life."

"There is no glory comparable to that of the citizen who dies for his Country."

"The duty of a soldier is to defend his flag unto death."

Education morale et Instruction civique, par A. NEZIERES of the French Academy:—

P. 37.—"She (the Country) has undergone great misfortunes; she lost two provinces. If your mother were ill, you would surround her with your care and tender love."

"Think that the Country is your second mother, that she suffers and weeps over the children they have torn away from her bosom. Love her, my friends, and do not forget the comfort she expects from you."

P. 80.— . . . . "One day you will serve France in a soldier's uniform. That day, my children, you will owe the country all your blood. The national history is full of admirable acts of courage accomplished on the battle-fields. Feed your memory with these glorious recollections, and make up your minds in advance to sacrifice everything, when you are grown up, to the salvation of the Country and the honour of the flag."

Lectures choisies, par BONNEHON ET TURGAN :—

P. 110.—" When one writes in other languages one may sometimes rest content to be understood by others if they can manage to do so; when one writes in French one must first understand oneself. . . . The French language is that in which one says best what one has got to say, in which it is most difficult for dishonest people to deceive others."

P. 202.—" The French are the only people whose morals can be depraved without the heart being depraved also. . . ."

Lecons de morale à l'Ecole primaire, par CURE ET HOUZELLE :—

P. 151.—" There is no country that deserves to be loved as much as France. To love one's Country is a natural sentiment : we prefer the French to other men, and France to all other nations. Moreover, for the very reason of the favours she bestows upon us, gratefulness compels us to consider her much above other nations."

De tout un peu, par A. TARTIERE :—

P. 72.—" What will you do when you are grown up? —Sir, I want to be a soldier to go to war and kill a lot of Prussians. They killed my uncle Peter, and grandmother always cries when they talk about him.—You are a brave boy, and the Prussians will have to behave."

Morale et Enseignement civique, par A. SEICNETTE (teacher's text-book) :—

P. 64.—Maxim : " He who does not love the Country absolutely, blindly, never will be more than the half of a man."

This is what is taught in the schools of the French Republic at the beginning of the twentieth century.

And let it not be said that lopped quotations do not prove anything; one has only to appeal to one's memories of childhood, one has only to

remember the text-books that were put into our hands at the time when we were on the school benches, one has only to turn over the pages of scholastic text-books which, up to the present day, are in great demand in public schools, to recognise that all these quotations clearly characterise the leading idea of the books from which they are extracted.

All the text-books of civic education, with very rare exceptions, are but cynical commentaries on the engravings in the history of M. Lavisse or the songs of M. Deroulède.

Just like these songs and engravings, they are redolent of the admiration of the sword, national vanity, and hatred of the foreigner.

The child, a credulous soul, religiously accepts what his schoolmaster teaches him, just as he accepts without hesitation the fairy tales of the Holy Scriptures.

The schoolmaster who himself has been fed by those books during his childhood, who, at the Ecole Normale,* never heard any other side of the question, who has for the words of the Lavisses and the Paul Berts the same superstitious respect as the young seminarist for the utterings of his bishop, teaches the patriotic dogma with the same serenity as the priest does the mysteries of revealed religions.

The child, once grown up and commencing to read the papers, has at least some chance to see the priest's teachings discussed, criticised, ridi-

* Ecole Normale: Training college.

culed; a salutary reaction frequently follows. When out of the ecclesiastical boarding-school, escaped from the seminary or from the narrow circle of family relations, the youth still will be able to shake his religious prejudices.

There are many less chances of ridding himself of the patriotic prejudice. After schooldays, everything reminds him of the patriotic education he received at school, and nothing counteracts it. The theatre, so full of military exhibitions and bellicose tirades; the stall at the fair, with its living pictures often representing war-like scenes; the illustrated supplements of the *Petit Journal* and the *Petit Parisien*, whose reproductions are all turned to the exaltation of the army and the Country, the largely circulated newspapers, insisting with so much complacency upon armaments, the army and navy manœuvres, the war features and diplomatic incidents; the military pictures which are countless in our museums—everything is marvellously combined to still more thrust into his brain the patriotism they have inculcated in him when a boy.

There are advanced papers which violently attack religion; there is not one large daily paper that dares attack patriotism.

CHAPTER VII.

The Patriotic Lies: The Classic Definitions of the Country.

Ask a French, English, German or Italian patriot what the Country is, and hear him repeat, parrot-fashion, the definitions of the Country which he has learned at school: so many affirmations, so many empty, senseless, or lying phrases.

"What is the Country, my good patriot?"

"It is the land where I was born."

"But no, parrot! If you were born at Landerneau,* if you grew up there, if you had your first enjoyments there, Landerneau must be your Country according to your definition. But that steeple-patriotism, which everybody possesses in some degree, is not what one calls patriotism: the love of the native village does not at all explain the love of all France with the towns and the villages where you were not born, where you never put a foot, and where, consequently, no childhood

* Landerneau, a place in Brittany which has the reputation of breeding none but fools.

reminiscences bind you. If, to-morrow, Landerneau were annexed by the Germans, Landerneau would nevertheless be your native land, the land to which all your remembrances of youth would remain attached."

"The Country is the land of my ancestors."

"That sounds well! The land of your ancestors! By a great stretch of imagination, one pictures generations of great-grandfathers covering the soil of the Country with their sweat and their blood. But one requires an extraordinary amount of imagination, sensibility and virtue to love ancestors whose shadows are lost in the dim and distant past."

Look here, good patriot! You love your father? I, too, love mine; your grandfather? I, too! Your great-grandfather? I, too! I heard such good talk about them, and one always speaks well of the dead even when during their lives they were vile and contemptible people; but, after all, you do not care any more about your ancestors, those you have not known, than you do about your first pair of breeches, do you? Neither do I.

Besides, if they bathed the land of Landerneau with their sweat and blood, love that corner of land, good patriot; but they have not bathed the whole of France. Do not hold yourself under obligation to love the towns and the villages which they have never drenched with their sweat and their blood.

Ah! they have soaked the native soil with their sweat and their blood, the ancestors; yes, they have shed much of it for their masters, the kings,

the nobles, and the priests; they would have done much better if they had shed less blood to enlarge the estates of their masters or to provide them with incomes, and to shed a little more to ameliorate their own condition (and ours in consequence) by falling with might and main on their kings, their lords, and their priests.

Some have revolted, it is true, but were our ancestors amongst the Jacques,* the Croquants,† and the Va-nu-pieds,‡ who many a time rose to action, or were they amid the soldiers of the king who smothered insurrections in blood? Were they amid the revolutionaries who, from 1789 to 1793, destroyed the charters and burnt down the castles, or were they amid the chouans* of Anjou, Brittany, Vendée, who fought against them, or amid the royalists of the South who wanted to deliver Lyons, and who did deliver Toulon, to the enemies of the Revolution?

"The Country is the land of the people of our race."

"But, in all European Countries, there are several different races; in Germany there are Slavonians and Germans; even in our Country, whose population is one of the most homogeneous, there are several races: The Provencial, who has much Latin blood in his veins, is by race much nearer the Italian than the Frenchman of the

---

* Jacques Bonhomme, a peasant revolutionary leader in the year 1358.

† Croquants: agricultural labourers.

‡ Va-nu-pieds: bare-foot goer, a wretch.

* Chouans: those who were for the King.

North; the Frenchman of the East has a great deal of German blood in his veins; there is no lack of Frenchmen in the North who are of the Flemish race; the Bretons are a different group, much nearer related to the Welsh, the Scotch, or the Irish than to the French of the North, the East, or the South. Besides, what Frenchman, what German of our days, after the sojourns of the French armies in Germany and the German armies in France, is certain he is not the son of one of the hostile soldiers who came as victors to the land of your ancestors?

"Besides, if the Countries are to include the people of one race, it has been established that the Italians, French, Germans, English have all common ancestors who came from Asia. All Europeans therefore ought to be our compatriots! And not only the European—why not all men, whatever the colour of their skin, provided they belong to the human race as we do?"

"The Country is the land where they speak our language!"

"Thirty years ago, most Alsacians spoke and understood but German; there were a million natives of Brittany who did not understand a word of French; there were thousands of peasants of the North who knew but Flemish, and yet all those people were French, and loved France.

"In Switzerland, a part of the population speaks German, another Italian, another French, and yet there is a Swiss Country. On the other hand, the Cubans, who speak Spanish, have just been driving out the Spaniards, and will not belong

to the Spanish Country; the North Americans speak English, and yet they are far from considering England as their Country. Thus it is not the community of language that essentially constitutes the Country."

"The Country is a sort of communion of ideas, sentiments, tastes, habits and interests which lead people to desire to live together apart from foreigners."

"Ah! is it not touching the community of ideas, and sentiments that unites the French, clerical and anti-clerical, Anti-Semites and free-thinkers, Nationalists and Dreyfusists, Royalists, Bonapartists, Republicans and Socialists? And please note that such a touching accord exists in Italy, in Spain, and in England. Every day it develops there as here into ardent polemics, insults, exchange of blows, and from time to time into shots. Is it not beautiful to see the communion of ideas and sentiments which unite the patriots of one and the same Country?

"If in one and the same Country, rich and poor will always belong to the same group and continue to live together, away from foreigners, distrusting other peoples, it is because in all Countries the rich teach the poor how to hate foreigners and other Countries. Otherwise, the workers and peasants of France would be no more reluctant to live in the same Country with the peasants and workers of Germany than the French and German Swiss are to live in one and the same Country."

"The Country is a mother, our common mother;

she is a great family, whose members all have common interests."

"This is the height of nonsense. One would think that people who write such funny things ignore the furious struggle which exists amongst all competitors in the same industry, the antagonism of interests which divides in one and the same Country Protectionists and Free Traders; still less, perhaps, do they consider that strikes, even when they are accompanied by the sacking of workshops and the shooting of strikers, show clearly and to a high degree the harmony and understanding which prevails between employers and wage-earners?

"In these singular families, which are called Countries, a few of the children are seated round a well-covered table, that wants for nothing, not even what is commonly called the butter-plate. They eat, they drink, they talk cheerfully, they enjoy themselves—intellectual and material enjoyment; they want for nothing. Life is for them one long banquet.

"Meanwhile the other members of the family toil like beasts of burden; they make the butter, so that it should not be missing on the tables of their brethren the privileged."

"The Country is a mother!"

"What is a mother?"

"It is a good, loving woman who, at the family table, divides what she has got amongst all her children, be they handsome or ugly, strong or weak: indeed, rather spoiling those who are ill."

But she is no mother who at the family table gorges a few of her children and leaves the others,

often the more deserving ones, wanting the necessaries of life; she is not a mother, she is a step-mother.

Countries—mothers! No, they are no mothers, but cruel step-mothers, and their disinherited sons have the right to execrate them—nay, it is their very duty.

CHAPTER VIII.

The French Patriotic Prejudices: The French are the First Soldiers in the World.

In every Country they succeed in making the miserable mass of the people believe that the Country is a mother. How else would they have got so far as to persuade them that their Country is the finest of all Countries, that that mother is the best of mothers?

In every Country the ruling classes have so well known how to exploit the old remains of human stupidity which is in all individuals, to so ably tickle the national vanity of all human agglomerations gathered by the fortunes of history, that in all Countries patriots are proud to belong to the particular one in which chance caused them to be born. The French patriot is proud of being French, the German patriot is proud of being German, even the very Russian moujik is proud of being born in the land of the knout. Every patriot really believes that his own Country is superior in many respects, and in no small degree, to other Countries.

Every Country has its own dose of patriotic

prejudices, and the French people have theirs—a large share.

They think, for instance, that the French soldiers are the finest soldiers in the world; but it is sufficient to know the military history of the French people in order to understand that there is, perhaps, not one nation in Europe that has to its record so many memorable defeats, ancient and modern.

With a handful of Roman soldiers, Julius Cæsar could manage innumerable armies of those terrible Gauls who, in spite of their boasting, feared something else altogether than the fall of heaven, and an insignificant Roman garrison was sufficient to keep those thunder-bolts of war in order.

Four centuries after the Roman conquest, tribes of Barbarians, not numerous, it would seem, made an irruption in Roman Gaul, and settled down as if they were at home in the midst of the peaceful Gallo-Roman population.

Four centuries after these brutes of German origin had infused a new blood into the mass of the Gallo-Roman population, tribes of plunderers, the Normans (again Germans!), braver than the French, because more brutal, sailed up the Seine, the Loir, and the Garonne in their barques: the invaders were only a handful, but as soon as they saw them, the ancestors of the "first soldiers in the world" ran away as quickly as they could, or shut themselves up behind the heavy walls of fortified castles. To make peace, the chief of the Frenchified Gallo-Romans had to grant their principal tribe the right to settle down as masters in the province since known as Normandy.

At the time of the Hundred Years' War the land of the brave was for a century ravaged by English tribes; at Crécy, in 1346, a handful of English drove into disorder an army of 40,000 French; at Poitiers, ten years later, 10,000 English beat 50,000 French, of whom 20,000 remained in their hands as prisoners; at Agincourt, half a century later, 20,000 English routed twice as many French; France became almost entirely English.

During the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the kings of France, whose subjects were the first soldiers in the world, took good care to call into their army entire bodies of foreigners—Hungarians, Swiss, Germans, Irishmen—to reinforce the broken-down French troops or to stiffen them when a decisive effort was to be made.

The wars of the Revolution and the first wars of the Empire disclosed during those few years military qualities which one did not know the French possessed; but were they really specific military virtues? That is to say, the blind courage of the unconscious brute who dashes into any obstacle, of the wild beast in whom the hunting instinct over-excites itself to paroxysm, the courage of the human beast maddened by fear or intoxicated by alcohol and powder, the passive and submissive resistance of the herd which dare not run away out of fear of the iron arm of discipline?

That which animated them, was it not, for once, the very clear consciousness that they were struggling to bring about a form of new society, superior

to that which then existed in all neighbouring countries, the enthusiasm of revolutionaries defending an ideal which had yet to be tried.

At any rate, it was a sudden blaze!

The rush and the enthusiasm soon died out, and new disasters came, adding to the already too long list of great national defeats.

The Napoleonic épopée, as the French patriots call it, ended by invasion; the first soldiers of the world were forced back from all the Countries they had entered.

The war with Spain began with the capitulation at Bailén in the open field of an army corps of the first soldiers of the world, who were gradually driven back from the South of Spain to Toulouse.

The Russian campaign terminated in a confusion.

During the campaign of 1813, one day it was a whole army corps which capitulated with General Vandamme; another day, at the Katzbach, it was Field-Marshal Macdonald's army which abandoned its whole artillery to the enemy, and the great emperor fled from Leipzig with great difficulty.

At Waterloo, the first soldiers of the world got so panic-stricken that they could not be reassembled but at 150 kilometres from the spot where Cambronne saved what the Chinese call the face and what we call honour.

Sebastopol, Magenta and Solferino had by now enfeebled our memory of the double invasion of 1814 and 1815, of the double entering into Paris of the Prussians and English, but at last the first

soldiers of the world outdid all the great feats of their fathers. For example:—

Capitulation of 80,000 men at Sedan, almost in the open field.

Capitulation of 180,000 men at Metz in an impregnable citadel, in front of an army scarcely more numerous.

Capitulation in Paris of 500,000 men before a besieging army much smaller than themselves.

Desperate retreat and disarmament of the army of the East in Switzerland!

Within the memory of man, no nation had undergone such military catastrophes.

The French hold the record for capitulations, but they, nevertheless, continue to regard themselves as thunderbolts of war, like their famous Gallic ancestors!

When, some day, they have come to a juster appreciation of their military prowess, they will, however, have one consolation left: they may rest assured that all peoples have in their annals a long list of similar catastrophes, which seem to show that no people hold a monopoly of military bravery, any more than of any other virtues.

CHAPTER IX.

The French Patriotic Prejudices: France is the Country of Chivalrous Generosity.

The French patriots have made another discovery, no less flattering to their national self-love; they believe their Country to be the great Country of generosity, of the spirit of chivalry.

It must be said that the English patriots award "la perfide Albion" the palm for those same virtues, and the German patriots award it to virtuous, generous and modest Germany.

If the German and English Countries deserve this tribute as much as the French Country (and they do deserve it nearly as much), assuredly such distinction must not be difficult to obtain.

France the upholder of right!

M. Delcassé, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, found a picturesque formula in which to express this "national" truism. It was at the time of an interpellation on the strife between France and the Sultan. A Socialist

deputy, Marcel Sembat, addressed him somewhat as follows:

> For five years, at the doors of Europe, the Turks out of religious fanaticism have been massacring an inoffensive and hard-working population, the Armenian people, whose great crime is to refuse to adopt the religion of Mohammed.
>
> These unhappy people, whose wives and daughters are violated, whose houses are pillaged, who are submitted to all sorts of vexations, are tendering suppliant hands towards civilised Europe: mourning Armenia is invoking your protection.
>
> No European Government would dare to oppose the disinterested intervention of France if she made an energetic demonstration against the Red Beast of Constantinople who authorises and encourages those massacres.
>
> You know it, and yet you do not act.
>
> Meanwhile, some merchants, only recently naturalised Frenchmen, Lorando and Tubini by name, have tendered the Sultan exhorbitant bills, debts augmented by 10, 20, and 30 per cent. The Sultan has disputed their figures, and has refused to pay the usurers. Tubini and Lorando complained to you, and immediately you have mobilised your fleet, and sent it to perform the work of a bailiff at the Sultan's.
>
> 300,000 massacred Armenians do not move you; but for £300,000 (Turkish) due to two scoundrelly financiers, you go to war.
>
> That is a foreign policy unworthy of the Republic!

The Minister's answer may be summed up in a sentence, which is a gem: "We have played long enough the role of Don Quixote."

Evidently, M. Delcassé, like the majority of his fellow citizens, imagines that France has in the past really played the part of Don Quixote, the brave knight ready to draw his sword even

against windmills, to defend the weak and oppressed. He has been taught at school that France was the protector of small nationalities; he has been told so: he has believed it; it is for him now an established and incontestable truism, and for all Frenchmen it is as true as gospel.

France the upholder of right! They told us so at school, and we, good and credulous patriots, were proud that in 1792 she had called all peoples to liberty, that she had enfranchised young America in revolt against England, Greece oppressed by the Turk, that she tried to save Poland, that she had given the young Italian nation her independence.

How very much there is to be unlearned, oh, patriots! when one studies her role in these events a little closer. The truth is that if there have always been Don Quixotes in France, as in all other countries, after all capable of devoting themselves to a general cause, the French Government, after the example of foreign Governments, has never practised Quixotism in what it may have of greatness and disinterestedness.

If it backed up the revolted Americans, it was to revenge itself on England, who had just taken Canada from her, if it backed up the Greeks against the Turks, it was out of clerical passion, out of hatred for Islamism, to carry on a crusade against the infidel; it had in its hands for a moment, under the Empire, the destiny of Poland and it brutally refused to give her back life and independence; finally, if it made Italian unity, it was only after it had secured a good quid pro

quo: in the shape of Nice and Savoy. Thus, even when fighting for the little ones, France has never had anything in common with Don Quixote.

And even in 1792, if the French revolutionaries talked of carrying liberty to all neighbouring peoples, if they called them to arms against their tyrants, it was not in an access of disinterested proselytism, but driven by the instinct of personal conservation which compelled them to find allies amid other peoples in order to enable them to resist a coalition of sovereign rulers.

When a country has on its conscience the wars of conquest of a Louis XIV. or of a Napoleon, the putting to fire of a Palatinate, the invasion of Holland, visits with sword and rifle to all the capitals of Europe by the Corsican bandit and his weather-beaten blackguards; when he stole their country from the Arabs, after having besmoked entire tribes in the grots of Dahra; when during fifty years he tolerated in the Soudan atrocities such as put the exploits of Voulet and Chanoine in the shade; when he made the expedition to Mexico; when twice in the course of forty years he put Peking to the sword and plundered it with Cousin de Montauban and General Frey; his statesmen, his journalists, his historians, and his schoolmasters ought to have the decency to refrain from comparing him with Don Quixote, for almost the whole of his history evokes the sinister figure of Cartouche.*

* Cartouche, the celebrated French thief.

CHAPTER X.

The French Patriotic Prejudices: France the Classical Land of Revolution and of Liberty.

Faith in the military superiority of their race is more particular to French patriots belonging to the retrograde parties, monarchists and nationalists; there is another illusion generally abroad, but which is more specially cherished by the French patriots of the advanced parties, especially those of the republican bourgeoisie.

For them France is the cradle of liberty, the land of the Rights of Men.* One should hear them celebrate their great Revolution of 1789-93 against which the English and American Revolutions scarcely count. What is the English revolution of the seventeeth century compared with theirs? Pooh! the merest event! What is the American Revolution and the Declaration of Rights of 1787? An incident in the life of the civilised world. There is only one revolution

* Declaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen, the famous charter proclaimed in 1789, after the fall of the Bastille.

that counts—the French Revolution; it alone has really shaken the world; it alone is a human event; it alone has staggered humanity. The French have heard it so often that they have come to believe it, and, what is more wonderful, they have succeeded in making others believe it, their neighbours and the remoter peoples abroad.

Here, again, the truth is sensibly different from the legend.

Without belittling the importance of the French Revolution and the resounding effect it had in the whole of Europe one may say that many a people have worked quite as efficiently for the emancipation of humanity, and that the French Revolution, if it has had happy imitations abroad, is itself but the rebound of great movements that had taken place outside.

Whatever the French Patriots may say, the English bourgeoisie had made its revolution more than a century before the French bourgeoisie; the English nation had had her Louis XVI. in the person of Charles I., and her Napoleon in the person of Cromwell; the jury, the liberty of the Press (at least for the bourgeois), a constitutional régime, the parliamentary régime, were first seen, not in France but in England. It was in England that Montesquieu and Voltaire and a good number of other destroyers of the ancient French monarchy went to learn in the school of liberty.

Thus, if there were a country that might claim the honour of being the pioneer of political liberty, it is not France but England, whose ideas spread themselves over the old world through the inter-

mediary of France, and over the new world through the intermediary of Anglo-Saxon America, whose republican organisation has served as a model and a stimulant to the whole of Latin America to enfranchise itself in its turn.

But would the English Revolution of the seventeenth century ever have taken place without the Reformation, whose birthplaces were John Huss's Bohemia and Luther's Germany?

And is not the German Reformation itself a child of the Italian Renaissance, which itself is but the resurrection on Italian soil of the free genius of ancient Greece?

He would be very wise who could say, after having weighed the advantages of the Italian Renaissance, the German Reformation, the English Revolution and the French Revolution, which of these great events has done most for the emancipation of mankind; which of the Italian, German, English or French peoples has done most for human liberty.

The truth is that all peoples have brought their stone to the common work, or that they will bring it to-morrow, and that at the present time all peoples have their contingent of revolted and subjected brutes, of vanguard-men, and of retrograde and routine-like minds.

And, unfortunately, in all countries the revolted and the men of free minds are a handful, and the others an innumerable host. The classical land of revolution, France, resembles from that point of view, to-day as in the past, all other neighbouring countries.

France had scarcely made her Revolution of 1789-93, astounded to have done it, when she rushed to the feet of Napoleon I.

An handful of energetic democrats had scarcely accomplished the Revolution of 1848 when the immense majority of the country acclaimed Napoleon III.

France has the republican form, the republican label to-day only because she had the good fortune to be thoroughly beaten in 1870. It is not the French Republicans who in a high struggle have conquered the actual Republic; Bebel was right when he said at the last Congress of Amsterdam that it was Bismarck, von Moltke and the Prussian Army who got it for them. The second Empire in France was the outcome of a military coup d'état, it lived by the army; if the imperial army had entered Berlin victorious instead of having been twice caught in a net at Metz and at Sedan the immense majority of the French people who took part in the great Revolution would have been down on their knees before the sprig of Napoleon III., just as the majority of the German people, who have not yet accomplished a revolution, is on its knees before the heir of William I.

CHAPTER XI.

Patriotism a Religion: The Worship of the Flag.

The young patriot is out of school. He has got some beard on his chin, he has started reading political papers, which have thrust into his brain the teachings of the school; he lacks not one of the patriotic prejudices that distinguish a good Frenchman. The patriot is complete.

Patriotism is for him a religion.

The revealed religions have their fanatical devotees; others, whose faith is somewhat reasoned, have lost fanaticism, but without blindly believing revealed truths, they have remained deists.

The religion of patriotism has likewise its fanatics who, according to the different countries, are called Nationalists or Imperialists; and devotees who in reasoning reject the exaggerations of patriotism, but who in the bottom of their hearts worship yet the ideal.

For the former and for the latter the Country is a kind of divinity whose name it is impious to pronounce irreverently; mysticism creeps into the patriotic sentiment even of the most reasoning

and most reasonable patriots. These are free thinkers who admit that everything should be discussed: God, property. There is but the Country who is above all discussion, or if they consent to discuss her, they talk of her with a filial tenderness, they show for her a sentimental preference approaching devotion. Both talk of the Country as the faithful talk of their God: the flag becomes the "sacred" emblem of the Country; the soil of the Country is the "sacred" soil of the Country even for the poor wretches who do not possess a square inch of land.

The old religions have their priests: the new patriotic religion has its own. On the pedestal on which the faithful's piety had placed the priest with a crown of purity and sanctity, the patriotic faith of their descendants has placed the soldier, the professional fighter—he who has chosen by taste, by calling, because his feelings drove him there, a military career, the noble calling of arms.

For that is *the* noble calling amongst all.

The noblest calling *par excellence* is not that of the miner who, at the peril of his life, painfully extracts from the depths of the earth the black mineral, the bread of machinery; it is not that of the agriculturist who tills the land whose harvest will be feeding mankind to-morrow. Neither is it that of the teacher who painfully tends uncultivated brains, trying to grow in them the good seed of a critical mind and free investigation.

The noblest calling of all is the military calling, the one in which as soon as one enters it,

one surrenders one's own personality, one's will; in which one is no longer anything more than a number, a machine. And what a machine! A machine for killing by order without knowing why: that is the noble calling of arms.

The army is the school of honour, of courage, of the spirit of sacrifice.

The faithful possesses a high idea of his religion: he believes it to be superior to all others; the Protestant looks with pity upon Catholic superstitions, the Catholic who recites his rosary smiles at the praying-mills of the Buddhist devotee, the Buddhist considers the Mussulman as a rough barbarian. It is just the same with the patriots. The Englishman thinks his Country the finest on earth; the American thinks young America is much superior to it; the Frenchman thinks the French Country a hundred thousand points above the German Country; for nothing in the world would the German patriot wish to see the German Country resemble the French Country; even the poor Russian moujik in his ignorant brain puts Holy Russia above all nations.

This vanity is ridiculous.

Unfortunately, the patriotic religion, like the other religions, creates another state of mind which is not only ridiculous but also dangerous. The old religions, at the time when faith was glowing in all hearts, were accompanied by hatred and distrust of heretics and infidels: fervent Catholics detested the Jews and other unbelievers for whom the wood-piles of the Holy Inquisition were lit; in the name of the God of peace and love they

made the Crusades against Mussulmans; according to history, they also treated the Protestants with some rigour. Protestants and Mussulmans were scarcely milder to those who did not belong to their religion.

Patriots of all countries often entertain similar feelings towards the foreigner, towards him who has committed the crime of having been born in another Country. The school, as we have seen, takes care to embitter the bloody memories that peoples drag behind them of the wars of the past. Until enlightened and generous minds of every nation throw off that dreadful instinct which the patriotic education of the school has often inculcated in them, the slightest international crisis, the slightest conflict between opposing sides of the frontiers will continue to precipitate them at one another's throats.

It is interesting to notice that in all countries the patriotic religion is cultivated in the minds of the people by the same process as in the case of the religions properly so called.

One as well as the other takes the child from its youth before its critical mind has begun to form; patriotic songs replace hymns, text-books of history and civic education replace Bible and catechism; instead of the priest's chasuble dazzling with gold and jewels, it is the squalling, noisy costumes of the soldiers and officers, a carnival-like mixture of blue, red, green, gilt, cock feathers and ostrich feathers; rosaries and other Catholic mummeries are replaced by performances of the drill-sergeant, whose mission is also to choke all initiative and all

thoughtfulness; it is no more the moving music of the organ, it is the soul-thrilling noise of the drums, the trumpets, warlike music; instead of processions we see reviews, parades, dressing in a line, filing off with great display—50,000 human marionnettes lifting their legs in cadence by commandment.

There is no public festivity either in Germany or in France which is not accompanied by a solemn exhibition of soldiers under arms. Every 14th of July, in honour of the great ancestors who took the Bastille, the French Army is exhorted on the public places of all the garrison towns.

Hundreds of thousands of citizens get up early in the morning to go and see the national guignol* roasting under the sun in his carnival-like costume.

And there they all shout frantic hurrahs when they see defiling, amid clouds of dust, interminable lines of men, horses, cannon, a formidable mass of butchery flesh and slaughter-house instruments.

And when there passes before them at the end of a stick, a piece of drapery, which is the sacred emblem of the Country, a religious shiver runs through their bodies, and they devotedly take off their hats before the icon, just as their fathers did before the Holy Sacrament.

Arrived at this degree of intellectual deformity, the patriot is a beast to be killed, he is ripe for the slaughter-house.

---

* Guignol: Marionette which serves to divert children in puppet-shows.

CHAPTER XII.

Why the Leading Classes Preach Patriotism to the People:

Patriotism the Upholder of the Capitalist System.

The love of the native village is a natural feeling almost inborn in man's breast; but the love of the Country, of the great Countries where chance caused us to be born, is an acquired, factitious, artificial sentiment. It is but by a long and skilful training that one succeeds in inculcating it in peoples; it is but by constant suggestion, by a poisoning that begins at the cradle, that one succeeds in impressing those poor wretches who possess nothing, and for whom the Country is but a step-mother that they should be ready to die for her joyfully.

It is not difficult to find out why, in all Countries, the leading classes carefully cultivate the patriotic feeling in the heart of the masses. The reason is they find in it a first-rate interest, a vital interest.

It is not because the rich one day, after consulting, should have come to the conclusion: "Let

us cultivate patriotism in the hearts of our peoples, because it is a sentiment which it is easy for us to uphold!"

The acts of a class are like the acts of individuals: they all have complex motives, often obscure. It is rather a powerful instinct of conservation than a reasoned sentiment which in every country incites the leading classes to preach patriotism to the people.

Patriots themselves, because the Country is for them a mother, have at all times confusedly felt the necessity of attaching, by a moral and almost mystical link, the mass of disinterested to the order of things of which the rich alone get the profit in every country.

Patriotism is precisely this moral link, almost religious, which in every country unites rich and poor, wolves and sheep.

It is good, it is useful, it is indispensable for the leading classes that the peoples they shear be profoundly convinced that the interests of the rich and of the poor are identical in every nation.

It is good, it is useful, it is indispensable for the leading classes that the pariahs of every Country consider the rich countrymen who exploit them, not as enemies, but as friends, and on certain days as brethren.

Patriotism in every nation masks the class antagonism to the great profit of the leading classes; through it, they prolong and facilitate its domination.

But patriotism is not only at the present hour the moral upholder of the capitalist system; it serves

as a pretext for the keeping up of formidable permanent armies, which are the material upholder, the last bulwark of the privileged classes.

The pretext, the only avowable and avowed aim of the army, is to defend the Country against the foreigner; but once dressed in the Country's livery, when the barrack training has killed in him every intelligence, every consciousness of his own interests, the man of the people is but a gendarme in the service of the exploiters against his brethren of misery.

In Russia, at St. Petersburg, on January 22, 1905, thousands of working men and working women moved forward in deep masses, unarmed, in suppliant attitude towards the Imperial Palace, where a delegation wanted to humbly present to the Csar the claims of the people. What did those poor wretches claim?

They came supplicating the Czar to grant the whole Russian nation the right to nominate representatives who would help him to make laws, who would control the Government's agents, who would prevent the grand dukes and the civil servants from cynically robbing the tax-payers, they were claiming the few guarantees which the leading classes in the whole of civilised Europe have been compelled to grant their subjects willy-nilly.

Around the Imperial Palace, at all strategical points of the town, thousands of soldiers were posted like so many ferocious watch-dogs. These soldiers were most of them sons of peasants, sons of working men, sons of wretched civil servants; by claiming for a limit to the exploitation of the

Russian nation by its leaders, the crowd was thus working for these soldiers themselves, for their fathers, their mothers, their brothers.

They had been torn away from their village amidst tears, under the pretext of defending the sacred soil of Holy Russia.

From their young days on they had been taught that a soldier must not discuss the orders he receives; he owes his Country the sacrifice of his life, even the secrifice of his reason.

In Russia the Country was then incarnate, and is still incarnate in a monarch who believes it to be to his interest to maintain the Russian nation under the régime of his good pleasure, and that of his relatives, his Ministers, and his high officials.

The master gave an order: and the Russian peasants and working men disguised as soldiers shot quite close at the unarmed crowd who came asking a little liberty and a little welfare for all members of the Russian nation without exception, including the soldiers and their families.

To-morrow, if back again into civil life, they come in their turn asking for reforms, other men of the people, wrapped up in the same military garments will massacre them as they massacred their brethren, in the name of the Czar, in the name of Holy Russia.

And in all countries the army is destined to the same work.

In Germany where hitherto the police have been sufficient to keep "order," the Emperor William repeats, when he gets the opportunity, the words he uttered at Potsdam at the beginning of his

reign: "You are my soldiers; you have given yourselves up to me body and soul; there is but one enemy for you, my enemy. In these times of Socialist intrigues, it may happen that I order you to shoot on your brothers and parents: God preserve us from it! but in that case you must obey without murmur."

In Italy and Spain, which are countries enjoying parliamentary monarchy, the massacres of working men or peasant strikers are countless. In France, where the Country is no longer incarnate in one man, where the Republic is like the anonymous government of the bourgeoisie, the "national" army is used for the same business of watch-dogging.

There is in all industrial centres a working-men's population that is being won to Socialist ideas.

The conscious minority would have soon done with involving the uneducated majority into a complete refounding of the mode of production and property, on collectivist and communist bases.

In face of a handful of masters there are, concentrated on a few points of the territory, thousands of proletarians who would make but a mouthful of them.

At Lille, at Roubaix, at St. Etienne, in all mining centres, in all large seaports, naval and commercial, in Paris and in Lyons, the working class represented by its trade unions, grouped in its Bourses du Travail, would soon have done with

proclaiming the expropriation, on the ground of public utility, of the master and proprietary class.

It would soon have done with giving the municipality the proprietorship and the custody of the houses.

It would soon have done with giving it the proprietorship and the working of lighting, transport, factories, and workshops.

It would soon have done with closing the small traders' shops, municipalising the large stores, and creating some more in every quarter; it would soon have done with burning the Ledger of Public Debt. the deeds heaped up at the solicitors, public accountants and bankers; to lay hands on the Bank of France, and to transform that bank into a public bank, issuing, instead of banknotes, "tickets of work or exchange," which the workers would receive in exchange for their work, and with which they would secure everything they need in the public stores.

And, provided one would not touch small peasant property, the peasant masses would allow it; especially if one abandoned to them, and the trade unions of journeymen and small rural proprietors, the agricultural estates held by the lords of the manors or the bourgeois drones.

For the first time in France, one would see the instruments of work in the hands of the workers; one would see the hive of workers and peasants at last rid of the drones that take the best of its honey; by a rational organisation of production, by an

enormous increase in consumption, by the incessant development of machinery, for the first time one would see all the inhabitants of a country well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, torn away from ignorance and overwork, from misery, and the insecurity of the morrow.

Sacred love of the Country! Fortunately, you are there to avoid such a catastrophe. Thanks to you the pariahs, who have nothing to lose nor anything to defend, consent to be soldiers. Oh, marvel of patriotism! They will endure without complaint, at least as a necessary evil, the hard military discipline. There they are trained.

Well, now let their fathers and their brothers, pariahs like themselves, move; let them strike to improve their lot; let them get nearer the butter plate with a threatening attitude. A discharge ordered by an officer who, by his social condition, belongs to the privileged class, and executed by the pariahs, will restore "order" again.

After Fourmies, Limoges! awaiting a Bloody Week like that which, in May, 1871, saw the massacre of 30,000 Parisian workers.

The day the disinherited of every country see clearly that their only real enemies are the capitalists who keep them in poverty, the insecurity of the morrow, overwork, misery, and ignorance, the Social Revolution will be accomplished.

Patriotism, by drawing together and mixing up rich and poor in one and the same Country, stands in the way of that vision of the class war, just as by placing formidable armies at the service of the

leading classes, it protects them against popular demands.

Patriotism is at the present hour the great obstacle to the diffusion of Socialism, which is based on the principle of the class war.

It is the most powerful obstacle that stands in the way of the Social Revolution.

CHAPTER XIII.

Why the Ruling Classes Preach Patriotism to the People:

The Little Profits of Foreign Wars.

Patriotism renders the ruling classes another service. It binds each proletariat body and soul to its ruling class when a conflict arises with a neighbouring ruling class, a conflict which may bring some profit to the rulers, but which never brings anything more than blows, increased taxes, and sufferings, without compensation, to the rank and file they lead.

There was a time in the history of humanity when the common people had a personal interest in defending the rich man's Country. Long ago in the distant past the peoples of Europe were so constituted and distributed that each member was one of a group which really possessed a common patrimony; at the origin of human societies, when first hunting, and, later, cattle breeding were the

only resources of human tribes, our ancestors lived in a rough communism which in many cases continued until the decline of their nomad habits, and in others flourished even after their settlement in agricultural lands. The tribe possessed hunting territories or pasture lands, which they contested with other tribes; it possessed herds which excited their neighbour's covetousness. It is evident that all of them, servants as well as chiefs, had an interest in defending the common patrimony. The loss of a rich hunting field, of a fat pasturage, of part or the whole of a herd, affected the servants as well as the masters. If one can give the name of patriotism to the sentiment which animated all the members of the tribe in face of the covetous envy of other tribes, that patriotism was reasonable even with the humblest servants, for they were interested: their well-being was at stake.

The interest of everyone to defend the common patrimony was also doubled by that instinct of personal conservation which perforce flourished in the succeeding age of barbarism, when the prisoner of war, the foreigner, could be put to death if he fell into the hands of brutes belonging to hostile tribes.

Later, when human tribes had fixed themselves to the soil, when individual ownership of land had, by its development, divided every city into rich and poor, into patricians and plebeians, there still remained some interest for the plebeians to defend the city, side by side with the patricians. There was, of course, for the plebeians a big risk to run if their city were taken: they risked falling into slavery.

It was not rare, indeed, for prisoners of war to be sold as slaves. However poor he was, the plebeian was a free man, enjoying a few rights: he was a man, while the slave was but an animal, a thing.

But since they no longer eat prisoners of war, since they are no longer killed, and can no more be reduced to slavery, the common people have no more interest in defending the Countries of which they are the pariahs.

They have such an interest in but one case, an extremely rare occurrence in the history of modern societies. It is when, having made a triumphant revolution against their leaders, the oppressed class having jumped at the throat of the oppressing class—then, if the oppressive class, in order to defend its threatened or lost privileges, calls to its help the foreign leading classes, then, but not until then, is there some interest for the common people to repulse the foreigner. That day they have an interest in fighting; for, though in appearance it is a foreign war, it is really a civil war, a class war they pursue, and the civil wars—the class wars—if they prove advantageous to the inferior class, are essentially wars where the disinherited have something to gain.

That case has occurred once in the history of modern France—at the time when the bourgeoisie made its revolution, with the help of the people, against the privileged of the ancient order.

There was a moment, in the history of the French nation when the French régime appeared to be much superior to all régimes then existing among neighbouring peoples; it was the moment

when, while the absolutist régime existed all around France, with its procession of privileges, France saw the fall within a few years, together with the Bastille and royal absolutism, of the great ecclesiastical possessions, part of the large estates of the nobility, the tithes, the quit-rents, all ancient feudal or demesnial duties. It seemed as if the old world was falling in without leaving a sign, and that out of its ruins would rise a new society where there would be no more privileges of birth or class, where one would never see again people bursting with over-feeding by the side of others hungry.

At that unique hour of hope, what man of the people would not have risen to defend a Revolution so full of promise? It was not a mystical patriotism that inspired the mass of the soldiers in Year I; they already saw in visions the new glad land; they saw themselves cultivating a land freed from heavy and hindering servitudes; they would acquire a few parcels of national land; taxes were to be little or none at all. On the other hand, one knew that if the emigrated nobles came back again victorious they would begin by re-establishing the whole abhorred régime, but not without having hanged a few agitators in each parish.

In the same way, the day the proletarians of one of the existing nations have, by a victorious revolution, laid their hands on the great instruments of work, to-day held by the capitalist minority, the day they have become in some Country or other co-proprietors of an immense social wealth, that day they will have a common patrimony to defend, and by defending it against the capitalist classes sur-

rounding, they will be really defending a superior social régime.

But, save in these cases of revolution, which are exceptional cases, the disinherited class have no interest whatever in defending the Country; for, except during and immediately after a revolution, the neighbouring countries have very nearly the same régime, though often under different governmental constitution.

In the Middle Ages, when the feudal régime, more or less modified by monarchies and the aristocratic and bourgeois communes, held sway over the whole of western, southern, and central Europe, what interest had the workers and peasants to march to death for their lords? During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, what interest, for instance, had the French peasants and workers in electing to be sheared rather by French kings and lords than by English kings and lords, who would soon have learned the language of the vanquished, like all handfuls of conquerors who settle amongst compact masses of the vanquished?

Two centuries later, when absolute monarchy was in full swing in the whole of Europe, when English constitutional monarchy was as hard for the people as absolute monarchy, why should the working and peasant masses have preferred to be governed and bled by French masters rather than by English, Spanish, or German masters?

And to-day, when the capitalist régime, everywhere the same under a diversity of governmental tickets, stretches over France, England, Germany,

Italy, and begins to flourish in Russia, where it is working the destruction of an antiquated régime, what interest have the proletarians of one or the other Country to get killed in international wars for the Country where they possess nothing, not even the right to regular work?

Will it be said that the next wars will be chiefly wars of colonial expansion, and that the proletarians themselves have an interest in the colonial expansion of their Country?

It is a widespread prejudice amongst the people, and one which the capitalist bourgeoisie encourages through its journals, that colonies are profitable not only to capitalists but to the workers of the home country.

Of course, under the régime of free competition, which is the basis of existing capitalist production, the colonies may serve as outlets to the industry of the Country, which is a godsend not only for the large employers, but ultimately for their workmen. But here is the reverse of the medal: the colony in its turn fiercely competes in certain products with the parent country.

The cotton mills of India at the present day are supplanting Manchester cotton in China, and that is not, one may be sure, for the greatest good of English workmen. Let Chinese markets be opened; let European capitalists, who are such internationalists when the question at stake is their own interest, build weaving mills and metal works in that human ant-nest where labour costs almost nothing, and when the products from them begin to pour into the European markets, involving crises

of unemployment, perhaps then will they realise that it is sometimes useful to nations as well as to individuals to be able to see further than the ends of their noses.

Let us count, finally, the cost in money—do not let us talk of men, that vile merchandise which does not count—of the acquisition of the French colonial Empire. Let us think of the milliards spent, and let us ask the question whether those miliards spent in the metropolis for useful works, for extinguishing the public debt or reducing taxation, would not have singularly relieved national production and facilitated French production by cheapening living in France, and by extending the means of competing on European markets with the other products of European nations?

Let those who believe in the necessity of the colonies bear in mind Switzerland and Belgium, two small countries who by their modest size or their situation were saved from infection with an idolatry of square miles in colonies, are amongst the most industrious countries of the world; that Belgium and Switzerland, the latter so poor and coal-less, have a trade nearly three times as important as that of France in proportion to its population.

Let us remember that Germany has hitherto been very well able to do without colonies, and that their absence has not impeded the formidable growth of German industry and German trade.

Those who believe in the usefulness and the necessity of colonies, even for the working class of the parent country, allow themselves to be hypno-

tised and deceived by the industrial and commercial development of England; they ascribe that development especially to its colonial Empire, whereas it is, above all, the result of England's richness in coal and iron ore, a richness which has secured to English capitalists an overwhelming advantage over their competitors less fortunate in that direction. Besides, ask the Irish peasants who live on potatoes and dwell in slums, as well as the millions of beggars and unemployed that England contains, whether it enriches them much to "possess" Canada, India, Cape Colony, Australia, and so many other colonies?

In fact, the proletarians have no more interest in the extension of the colonial empire of their Country than they have in its territorial expansion in Europe.

But, it will be said, if the proletarians, and, generally speaking, the common people have nothing to lose by changing their Country, why did the Alsacian-Lorrainers, for instance, so violently protest against German annexation?

If the Alsacians, annexed by force in 1871, have suffered morally from the annexation, it is because from their childhood they had been blinded with patriotism, blinded and stultified. They had learned in family, at school, through their newspapers and books, that France was a mother to them; that the French were the people most free, the richest, the bravest, the most spiritual, the happiest on earth; that the Germans were a collection of brutes behind the times, violent and imbecile. With such ideas instilled into them,

they were forced within the space of a single day to become Germans! Who would not understand their moral suffering, their sad weeping?

If they had not been stultified beforehand with patriotic prejudices, they would soon have discovered (they are discovering it!) that exploitation and sweating in Germany or in France is about the same thing for a poor devil.

But one must go further, and say that not only have people no interest whatever in defending their Country, but they are often interested in her defeat.

During the wars of the Revolution and of the Empire, it was to the interest of the Spanish people, the German people, and the Russian people that their Countries should be defeated, and that they should be annexed by the Napoleonic government, for French occupation would have involved for them at that time the fall of feudal servitudes, of clerical power, and the partitioning of the great aristocratic estates by the article of the Napoleonic code establishing the equality of children before parental inheritance.

Likewise, it was to the interest of the French people that the French Army should be taken at Metz and at Sedan, for those two defeats have gained them the few thin liberties that the Republic, even bourgeois as it is, represents for them; whereas a victory of the armies of Napoleon III. would have prolonged in France the Imperial régime.

Similarly, to take a more recent example, it

would be to the interest of the Russian people that the Russian armies be captured by the Japanese; a Russian Sedan with a good capitulation like that of Metz, would mean at the present hour the certain downfall of Czarism.

But if the men of the people who get themselves killed for the actual Countries are the dupes of the patriotic prejudices which have been inculcated into them, one can easily understand the interest which the ruling classes had at all times in being patriots and in making the people share the love of Countries which for them are so sweet. When the kings of France and England fought for one hundred years in order to settle which of them should remain the possessor of France, one cannot see what the artisans and workers of France or of England might have gained or lost at the issue of the struggle; but one can see clearly what the two reigning families and the lords of the surrounding lands had to gain or to lose. The victory of the kings of England meant, besides a notable satisfaction for their ambition, an increase in income; it was, for the English lords, the capture of the finest estates of France which they would have stolen from the French lords.

When Charles V. and François I. were contending for Burgundy or the Italian provinces, when Louis XIV. and the Hapsburgs of Spain or Austria were contending for Artois or Flanders, one cannot see what good motive could induce French, Spanish, or Austrian peasants or workmen of the time to throw themselves headlong into the struggle; but one can see immediately the profit

to the interested sovereigns as well as their nobility, their generals, their diplomatists, and the contractors of their armies.

When Napoleon, impelled by his passion for war and by his folly for greatness, was putting Europe to fire and sword, one cannot easily see the advantages which the mass of French peasants and workers could draw therefrom. We should even be proud, if we were patriots, to know that there could be found in 1813 thousands of our ancestors who refused to go to the butchery, and who preferred to shoot at the gendarmerie who tried to enlist them by force; but one finds no difficulty in understanding what there was to be gained at that game of battles, by officers seeking promotion, or Field-Marshals who, after each victory, received, under the form of majorates, incomes of 100,000 and 200,000 francs from the French State, besides large estates.

Certain well-intentioned pacifists endeavour to prove, in order to bring war into disrepute, that warfare does not even serve the ruling classes who fancy they have some interest in it. Those pacifists are wrong in many cases.

M. Leygues, a former Cabinet Minister, was right when, in the course of a great debate on foreign politics in the Chamber, he said cynically: "Iron calls for gold." Yes, iron calls gold—into certain pockets. The two Chinese expeditions, that of 1860 and that of 1900, have filled those of General Cousin de Montauban, of General Fray, and a good number of weather-beaten soldiers.

The Tonkin expedition has certainly not injured

the fortune of the Viceroy Doumer,* nor that of Madagascar the Société des voitures Lefèvre."†

The slightest colonial expedition is a godsend for the shipping companies which transport the soldiers, the supplies and the material of the expeditionary bodies.

Worse even, a great war in Europe, whatever its issue, is a rain of gold for the providers of cardboard boot-soles or damaged meat, for the railway companies, for the bankers, who, after the defeat negotiate loans of 5 milliards for indemnities, for the great gunmakers and cartridge manufacturers who, during the war, unload their stocks, and who, once the war is finished, set to work to heap up new supplies improved in accordance with latest experience.

What a gold mine patriotism is for the ruling classes; but also what a fool's trap for the people!

---

* M. Doumer, ex-Governor-General of Indo-China, who later became President of the Chamber of Deputies.

† Société des voitures Lefèvre, for the building of ambulance vehicles.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Internationalism of Patriot Socialists.

The formulators of the French Revolution conceived a solidarity which was to unite the peoples from one end of the world to the other in their struggle against the ruling classes; they dreamed of raising everywhere the peoples against their "tyrants."

Almost all peoples, blinded by their imbecile patriotism, answered it by throwing themselves on revolutionary France in order to defend their tyrants. The reception with which their fraternal advances were met contributed not a little to throw back the French revolutionaries into the warlike nationalism which ended in the bloody orgies of Napoleon I.

The credit of having taken up again the idea of the revolutionaries of 1792, and of giving it some life, belongs to the Socialists, who founded in 1864 the International Association of Workers, which

gave to the people this rallying-cry: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

The war of 1870-71 would have strangled the International at birth, by developing amongst German and French Socialists implacable hatreds, if internationalism were not, at the present hour, one of the deepest aspirations, one of the most pressing needs of a proletariat which works no longer for special national markets, but for the whole world-market, and which has to do with a capital that knows no frontiers.

Full justice must be rendered to the French and German Socialist parties, to whom declarations of internationalism must have been particularly difficult and painful on the morrow of a war, that they have never hidden the Red Flag of Internationalism. It is significant that in France the pre-eminent Socialist hymn, that which is sung in all meetings and demonstrations of the Party is just that one called the "International."

> Then, comrades, come rally,
> This last fight let us face;
> L'Internationalé
> Unites the human race.

In the French Parliament there is but one Party which has fought systematically against all increases of military expenditure, that is the Socialist Party, and the last Congress of the Party, that which voted the fusion of all former Socialist organisations of France into one unified Party, has particularly specified that the Socialist deputies will have in the future to abstain from voting for

the Budget in bulk, and especially for the War Budget.

In Germany the Socialists have always refused to vote for the War Budget.

The question of Alsace-Lorraine is a thorny one, in dealing with which the German and French Socialists have had the courage to grapple with the public opinion of their countries. On the morrow of the war, at the moment when the pride of the recent victories had turned all German heads, the two leaders of the German Socialist Party, Bebel and Liebknecht, protested with all their might against annexation, which seemed to them not only an odious brutality, but also a signal blunder. To muzzle them they were both sentenced to eighteen months' detention in a fortress.

In France, whereas the rancours of defeat are still far from being extinguished, the leader of the Parliamentary Socialists, Jaurès, has dared to repudiate all idea of revenge, and, on the other hand, has extolled the idea of a rapprochement with Germany.

By that attitude, which is not without merit, the Socialists of France and Germany have unquestionably contributed to relax the tension between the two countries, and to create in Europe an atmosphere of peace which has rendered less dangerous the provocations, indiscretions and blunders of official diplomatists. They have carried forward a step the idea of a one and federated Europe; they have launched into the minds of the masses the conception of a United States of Europe; above all, they have started the

proletariat of the different Countries on the line of thought that there are in the world but two Countries, that of the rich and that of the poor.

At the Congress of Marseilles, Liebknecht, the veteran of German Social-Democracy, expressed the internationalist conception of Socialism in its entirety, when he said:—

> For us Socialists there is no question of nationality. We know but two nations: the nation of the capitalists, the bourgeoisie and the possessing class, on one side; and on the other the nation of proletarians, the mass of disinherited, the working class. And we all are French Socialists and German Socialists, of that second nation. We are one nation only: the workers of all countries form one nation, only opposed to the other, which is also one and the same in all countries.

In the Communist Manifesto of 1847, Karl Marx, one of the Fathers of the Socialist Church had already expressed the idea with even more force when he wrote:—

> The proletarians have no Country; one cannot take away from them what they have not got.

The non-Socialist public which in both countries hears of these demonstrations has therefrom drawn the conclusion that both countries are anti-patriotic. Against that accusation the Socialist leaders have always defended themselves with a touching unanimity.

"We anti-patriots, nonsense! We are internationalists, but we are patriots; we are even more patriotic than you; we are the only real patriots!"

In France and in Germany, who has not read in

a Socialist paper, who has not heard in a Socialist election meeting these protestations?

On June 9th, 1893, the "Parti Ouvrier Français" published a manifesto in which it expressed itself as follows:—

> In their powerless rage against the ascending progress of the Parti ouvrier, its class adversaries have recourse to the only weapon they have left—calumny. They are misrepresenting our internationalism as they tried to misrepresent our Socialism. . . . .
>
> Internationalism is neither the deprecation nor the sacrifice of the Country. . . . . One does not cease to be a patriot by entering the ranks of internationalism, which stands for the complete emancipation of humanity, any more than one ceased to be a Provençal, a Burgundian, a Fleming, or a Breton, by becoming French.
>
> The French Socialists are also patriots from another point of view, and for other reasons: because France has been in the past, and is destined in the future to be one of the most important factors in the social revolution. Thus we demand—and we cannot afford not to demand —a France great and strong, capable of defending her Republic against monarchies, and capable of protecting her next working-class "89" against a coalition, at least probable, of capitalist Europe. . . . .

This document was signed Jules Guesde, Paul Lafargue, Dereure, Prévost, etc.

Four months after the publication of that Manifesto, the Eleventh National Congress of the "Parti Ouvrier Français," gathered at Paris on October 7th, 8th, and 9th, 1893, passed the following resolution:—

> International solidarity does not exclude, neither does it limit, the right and the duty of a nation to defend

itself against a Government, whichever it may be, which endangers European peace.

France once attacked would have no more ardent defenders than the Socialists of the Parti Ouvrier.

As time rolls on, and the heroic times of French Socialism recede into the past, Socialists talk of the Country more and more like patriots. Francis de Pressensé, Deputy of Lyons, in a tumultuous sitting of the Chamber on April 19th, 1905, said:—

> There is nobody here who does not doubt that there were attempts against the highest principles of the rights of men, the rights of peoples in 1871, and does not recognise with sorrow that as long as they exist there will be some uneasiness between France and Germany.

Of course, de Pressensé's sorrow is sincere, and his patriot's heart suffers cruelly on account of the brutal annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.

In the same sitting, Jaurès, coming back again once more, with a courage meritorious in a parliamentarian, to his idea of a rapprochement with Germany, exalted the greatness of the French Country in a magnificent speech, punctuated by enthusiastic applause from the whole Assembly:—

> The long history of France is such a marvellous accumulation of genius, heroism, noble human passion, that even through the dark hours a radiance emanates from her. (Great applause.) The wound that has pierced one of her flanks and wounded her heart has not diminished her size. (Considerable applause from a great number of benches.) There is nobody in the world before whom she should have to stoop her head or cast down her eyes.—(Applause on the same benches).—Official Journal, sitting of April 15th, 1905.

Deroulède himself would have said no better.

When one is a patriot, one must be ready to defend the Country in case it is attacked.

In France, the Parliamentary leaders of the Socialist Party do not miss an opportunity of declaring that in case France were attacked they would march like one man.

In Germany, the Socialist leaders have never spoken otherwise. In 1891, at the National Congress of German Social-Democracy at Erfurth, Liebknecht, who was accused of leaning towards chauvinism, answered:—

> I am reproached with having declared that if we were attacked, if we had to fight to repulse an aggressor, we were ready to defend the Country. Oh yes, certainly, I have declared it several times; it is something which is evident; everyone of us feels it. . . . . Does not our own interest prompt us to repulse anybody who invades our country, just as we turn out a thief who breaks into our home?

Very recently Bebel, in the very Reichstag, answered his adversaries who charged him with anti-patriotism:—

> If ever Germany were attacked, if Germany's existence were at stake, then, I give you my word for it, we all, from the youngest to the oldest, would be ready to take a rifle upon our shoulders and to march upon the enemy. And what I say here is not for you (the Right) but for us, for this land is also our Country. It is the Country for us even more than for you. We would defend ourselves to our last breath, I give you my word!

Thus, there is no doubt that the German and French Socialists are patriot-internationalists.

And the International Socialist Congresses never

took any other attitude on the question: let it be judged by the decisions of the most recent International Congresses relative to the question of militarism and internationalism.

Here is first a motion voted by the International Workers' Socialist Congress of Paris, July 14th to 21st, 1889:—

> The International Workers' Socialist Congress of Paris,
>
> Considering,
>
> That the *permanent army*, or the *armed force*, at the service of the reigning or possessing class is the negation of all democratic or republican régime, the military expression of the monarchical or oligarchic and capitalist régime, an instrument of reactionary coups d'êtat and of social oppression;
>
> That as a result, and because of the system of aggressive wars, constant danger of international conflicts, the permanent army and the offensive policy of which it is the organ, must give place to the defensive and pacific policy of the democracy, to the *organisation of the whole people drilled and armed*, no more for pillage and conquest, but for the safety of its independence and its liberties.
>
> That the permanent army, an incessant cause of war, is, as history shows, incapable of defending a country against the superior forces of a coalition, and that its defeat leaves the country disarmed, at the mercy of the vanquishers, whereas the *prepared nation*, organised and armed, would be impregnable to invasion;
>
> That the *permanent army* causes the disorganisation of all civil life, taking from each nation and confining in barracks, to its demoralisation, its best youth at the period for apprenticeship, studies, of greatest activity and action;
>
> That labour, science and art are thus impeded in their progress and rendered sterile; the citizen, the indi-

vidual, the family affected in its existence and development;

That, on the contrary, in the real *national* army, or *armed nation*, the citizen can pursue in national life the development of his aptitudes, his faculties, and exercise his military functions as a necessary attribute of this citizen qualification;

Considering,

That the *permanent army* by the incessantly increasing charges of the war debt, by the ever-aggravated taxes and loans which it involves, is a cause of misery and ruin;

Strongly repudiates the *warlike schemes* cherished by governments at bay;

Affirms *peace* to be the first and indispensable condition of all working-class emancipation;

And claims, together with *the abolition of permanent armies*, the *general armament* of the people on the following bases:—

The national army, or the armed nation, formed of all valid citizens, territorially organised, so that every town or district shall have its battalion, composed of citizens who know one another, gathered, armed, equipped, and ready to march, if necessary, within twenty-four hours. To everyone his rifle and equipment at home, as in Switzerland, for the defence of public liberties and national security.

The Congress declares, further, that *war*, the fatal outcome of the existing economic conditions, will but definitely disappear with the total disappearance of the capitalist order, the emancipation of labour, and the international triumph of Socialism.

As far as the affirmation of pacific aspirations is concerned, that declaration leaves nothing to be desired; but by admitting the principle of "the

armed nation for the safety of its independence and its liberties," the Paris Congress has implicitly declared that it interested itself in the defence of the existing Countries, and thus has shown that it remained patriot in any case. For being purged of all warlike ardour and of all hatred of the foreigner, that patriotism is nevertheless patriotism, provided it admits the possibility of the proletarian giving his life for the defence of an existing Country.

The Paris Congress, in that declaration, implies more than a belief in the possibility of the proletariat taking part in international wars: it declares those international wars to be inevitable.

The last paragraph of the declaration says formally: "War is the fatal outcome of the actual economic conditions. It will but definitely disappear with the total disappearance of the capitalist order, the emancipation of labour, and the international triumph of Socialism."

Meanwhile, if a war breaks out in spite of the Socialists, what must be their attitude?

The Congress did not dare to face that question; it preferred not to make any statement; or, rather, it has made a statement which admits that it is the duty of a nation to defend itself. The duty of Socialists will thus be to participate in the defence of the Country to which they belong.

The Brussels (1891) and Zurich (1893) Congresses did more: they rejected—we will see by and for what reason—a proposal which was made to them to answer a declaration of war by insurrection.

The London Congress of 1896, coming back to the very platitudinous general declarations of the

Paris Congress of 1889, voted the following motion :—

> Under a capitalist era, the *principal causes of wars* are not religious or national differences, but the *economic antagonism* to which the ruling classes of the different countries are driven by the mode of production. Just as the capitalist unceasingly sacrifices the life and the health of the workers on the battlefield of *labour*, he feels no scruple in making them shed their blood in view of the new profits to be obtained by the conquest of new openings.
>
> Thus it is the duty of the working class of all countries to stand up against *military oppression* for the same reason as against all other forms of exploitation by which it is made the victim of the possessing class.
>
> With that end in view, it must *conquer political power* in order to abolish the mode of capitalist production, and refuse, simultaneously in all countries, to the governments, instruments of the capitalist class, *the means of maintaining* the actual order of things.
>
> The *permanent armies*, whose maintenance already exhausts nations in time of peace, and whose costs are borne by the working class, increase the danger of war between nations, and favour, above all, the even more brutal oppression of the workers of each country. That is the reason why the call, "Down with arms!" is no more listened to by the capitalist class than any other appeals to humanitarian sentiments.
>
> The proletarian class alone can have the earnest will and the power to bring about the world's peace.
>
> It claims :—
>
> 1. The abolition of *permanent armies*, and the organisation of the *armed nation;*
>
> 2. The institution of *courts of arbitration* entrusted with the pacific regulation of disputes between nations;
>
> 3. The final decision on the question of peace and war to be left directly to the *people* in cases where the governments do not accept the *arbitrator's award*.

> And it protests against the system of *secret treaties*.
>
> But the proletarian class will really arrive at its ends in this matter as in every other working-class question, only by securing control over legislation, and by allying itself to international Socialism which is alone able to ensure peace, and to bring about the real fraternity of peoples.

In 1896, as in 1889, the Socialist Party affirms that "the proletarian class alone can have the earnest will and the power to bring about the peace of the world."

But it hastens to add that war will not be averted "but by securing control over legislation, and by allying itself to international Socialism which is alone able to ensure peace, and to bring about the real fraternity of peoples."

Very well! But until the proletariat has secured control over legislation, what if meantime war breaks out?

The last International Congress of the Party which has touched upon the question, that of Paris (1900), continued the tradition of solemn and pious resolutions which strongly affirm the pacific and international character of Socialism, but which dare not attack patriotic sentiment or define the duty of Socialists in case of war.

Here are the motions voted at Paris in 1900:—

> I.—The Congress declares it to be necessary in all countries to re-double zeal, energy, and vigour in the daily struggle against militarism, that it is above all necessary to oppose to the *alliance* of the bourgeoisie and the imperialist governments, an alliance of the proletarians of all countries.
>
> The Congress indicates as a course of action :—
>
> 1. That the different Socialist parties foster the

education and the *organisation of the youth* with a view to combating militarism;

2. That the Socialist deputies in all countries pledge themselves to vote *against any military expenditure*, and all expenses for the *navy* and military *colonial* expeditions.

3. That the permanent International Socialist Commission will be entrusted with the starting and regulating, in all cases of international importance of a *uniform and common movement of protest and anti-militarist agitation* in all countries;

The Congress protests against the so-called *peace conferences*, such as that of The Hague, which, in the existing state of society can but end in regrettable deceptions, as has been shown lately in the case of the *Transvaal* war.

II.—1. The Paris International Socialist Congress indignantly condemns the savage policy of oppression displayed by *Russian Czarism* towards the *Polish and Finnish people*, and calls upon the proletarians of all nationalities, suffering under the yoke of absolutist régime, to gather together for the common struggle against that common enemy of democracy and Socialism.

2. The Congress condemns the atrocities of the British Government towards the *Boers* in South Africa.

The Paris International Socialist Congress affirming once more the sentiments of fraternal sympathy which must unite all peoples, stands up with indignation against the violence and massacres committed in *Armenia*, denounces to the workers of the two hemispheres the criminal complicity of the different capitalist governments, calls upon the Socialist Parliamentary groups to intervene at every opportunity in favour of the Armenian people, so wickedly oppressed, to whom the Congress sends the assurance of its close and ardent solidarity.

It is always the same old story!

In all cases of international importance, "a uniform and common movement of protest and anti-militarist agitation in all countries" will be created; but they do not go back on the decisions of the Congresses of Brussels (1891) and of Zurich (1893), which rejected insurrection in case of war.

Vague formulæ, no practical resolution.

Powerless to conciliate patriotism and internationalism—the military duty of Socialists towards their Country in case of war, and their revolutionary duty—the International Socialist Party in its national and international Congresses have chosen rather not to face the problem. With a cleverness acquired in parliamentary circles, its leaders have manœuvred, cavilled, ratiocinated, talked round the question.

One day you believe them to be anti-patriots, you think they consider the proletarians to have no Country, that they have thus no Country to defend. The next day you hear them proclaiming that they will rise up en masse at the first sign of an attack upon their Country.

They are patriots without being so, whilst they are so. How long is that skilful strategy going to last?

CHAPTER XV.

Inconsistency and Dangers of Patriot Internationalism.

In August, 1904, an International Socialist Congress which embraced representatives of the Socialist parties of the whole world, was held at Amsterdam. The principal event was a debate on the respective merits of reformism and of the revolutionary method. The French Revolutionary Socialists, under the leadership of Guesde, charged the French Reformists, led by Jaurès, with deviation and compromise, which in France and abroad compromised the future of Socialism.

Without putting Jaurès and the French Reformist Socialists outside the great Socialist family, the Congress voted, by modifying it slightly so that it should not offend anyone, the following motion, which had been voted the preceding year at the German Socialist Congress of Dresden, and

which is since known in Socialist circles under the name of "The motion of Amsterdam."

> The Congress affirms most strongly the necessity of maintaining inflexibly our tried and glorious policy based upon the class struggle, and not to replace the conquest of political power in high struggle against the bourgeoisie by a policy of concession to the established order.
>
> The consequence of such a revisionist policy would be to make of a party which aims for the quickest possible transformation of bourgeois society into a Socialist society—of a party thus revolutionary in the best sense of the word—a party contenting itself with reforming the bourgeois society.
>
> For this reason, the Congress, convinced that, as opposed to existing revisionist tendencies, class antagonisms, instead of diminishing, are growing, declares :—
>
> 1. That the party declines all responsibility, whatever it may be, under the present political and economic conditions, based as they are upon a capitalist mode of production, and could not, therefore, support any of the means likely to maintain the dominant class in power;
>
> 2. That the Socialist democracy could not accept any participation in the government of such bourgeois society according to the Kautsky motion voted at the Paris International Congress in 1900.
>
> The Congress, moreover, condemns any attempt to mask ever-increasing class antagonisms in order to facilitate a rapprochement with the bourgeois parties.
>
> The Congress counts upon the Socialist Parliamentary group to make use of its increased power as well by the augmented number of its members as by the considerable increase of the mass of electors who follow it, in persevering in its propaganda upon the final aim of Socialism, and, according to our programme, in defending in the most resolute fashion the interests of the working class, the extension and a consolidation of

public liberties, in claiming the equality of rights for all; to continue with increased energy the struggle against militarism, against colonial and imperialist policy, against any kind of injustice, subjection and exploitation, and, finally, to exert themselves energetically to improve social legislation and render it possible for the working class to accomplish its political and civilising mission.

In accordance with the formal and pressing invitation of the International Congress, the different French Socialist organisations nominated a Commission of Unification which had for its mission the elaboration of a scheme of declaration of principles and rules.

The rules and the scheme of declaration were accepted unanimously at the Congress of Socialist Unity (April, 1905), so that to-day in France there is but one Socialist Party, whose official name is, "Socialist Party: French Section of the Workers' International."

The first of the declaration of principles, voted and signed by all the contracting organisations, runs as follows:—

The Socialist Party is a class party which has for its aim the socialisation of the means of production and exchange, e.g., the transformation of capitalist society into a collectivist or communist society by the economic and political organisation of the proletariat. By its aim, by its ideal, by the means it adopts, the Socialist Party, although pursuing the realisation of immediate reforms demanded by the working class, is not a party of reform but a party of class struggle and revolution.

Now, this much is clear: for the International Congress of Amsterdam (1904) as for the Socialists

of France, who united at the Paris Congress of 1905, the Socialist Party is not a party of reform, but a party of revolution.

Now, what is it to be a patriot?

If the word has any sense at all, to be a patriot means to love one's Country, not the ideal Country, the Socialist Country which all Socialists carry in their hearts and long for so passionately, but the existing Country.

The leaders of parliamentary Socialism love the present Country, in spite of the faults and defects they know she has, to the extent that if she were attacked they would lay down their lives for her. They recognise that a terrible, atrocious class struggle exists within every Country, but they are, nevertheless, ready to go to death fighting, not class against class but side by side with the inimical classes, against the joined classes of the neighbouring Countries; they are ready to make common cause with their rulers on a battlefield.

They are internationalists, but if the German Government attacks France, or if the French Government attacks Germany, French proletarians and German proletarians will slaughter one another for the defence of their respective Countries. Although at an International Congress they have affirmed that the Socialist Party is an internationalist class-struggle party, French capitalists and proletarians will unite to throw themselves upon the German armies, where also capitalists and proletarians will be mixed up. Bebel on one side, Jaurès on the other, each with a rifle, will die, one for the German Country, the other for the

French Country. To such inconsistencies the internationalism of patriot Socialists leads.

In fact, one must be a subtle rhetorician to reconcile those irreconcilable ideas, internationalism and patriotism, the class struggle and the communion of classes in the love of a common Country.

If there were but a lack of logic in the attitude of patriot internationalists, one might remain silent. Theoretical and doctrinal discussions do not always stand in the way of common action, but, unfortunately, theory here essentially involves a practice which is dangerous.

German and French Socialists say: "We will defend our Country if it is attacked," without having ever dared to declare boldly: "And if it is she who attacks, we will stand up against her."

But saying that one will defend his Country if she is attacked, comes to saying that one will defend her in all cases, even if it is she who attacks.

And why? Because it is nearly impossible, at the moment a conflict breaks out, to know who is the real aggressor.

In 1870 it was the French Government who declared war; but if it is true that Bismarck altered the text of the famous despatch of Ems, as he has boasted, it must be recognised that the German Government shares with the French Government at least one-half of the responsibility for the declaration of war.

In the Anglo-Boer war, it was the Boers who began the war; but in reality, who rendered it inevitable? The Boers or the English?

In the present Russo-Japanese war it was the Japanese who commenced hostilities; but did not the Russians deserve at least as much as they the title of aggressors?

If to-morrow or in ten years' time the Japanese rulers, in order to revenge themselves for the unfair aid granted the Russian Fleet in the French ports of Madagascar and Indo-China, throw the French capitalists and their soldiers out of Tonkin, to whom shall the title of aggressor in strict justice be attributed?

They tell us that the Country will have their help in case of aggression. Trust the capitalist press of each country; the French Press will not fail to prove to those of the French people who have remained patriot that it is the Germans who started the quarrel, while the German Press will not be long in demonstrating conclusively to the mass of the German people still remained patriots, that it is the French who have been in the wrong all along. The Government which wants war, and which disposes of the telegraph, will easily be able, by a manœuvre at the last moment, to lead its subjects to believe that it is attacked, be it only by issuing a false report that a hostile body has crossed the frontier.

"The frontiers," rightly says one of our adversaries, "are nests of pretexts. With a gamekeeper, a coloured corner-post, and two boys, a determined sovereign holds his war."

By persevering in their equivocal attitude, the Socialists have no means of preventing a war.

Knowing that they will march, the Governments will not fear to let loose the dogs of war when they think they have some interest in doing so. And as they will not have dared to recommend or prepare in advance insurrection in case of war, Socialists will miss the only opportunity that offers itself to them of making that Social Revolution of which they all talk, but which they seem to dread as much as the ruling classes.

Then will Socialist leaders understand that in no case can Socialists slaughter one another for the present Countries, and that an international war which would set German and French Socialists at each other's throats, would be the failure and the shame of the International!

CHAPTER XVI.

The Anti-Patriot Socialists.

It is time to react against that half-hearted mongrel internationalism which pretends to conciliate patriotism with internationalism.

Provided it is impossible to know at the moment when a conflict breaks out who is the aggressor, it is high time to substitute for the equivocal formula of patriot Socialists: "We will defend our Country if it is attacked," this formula, plain and clear for everybody, for the proletarians as well as for the rulers: "Whoever be the aggressor, rather insurrection than war!"

When the rulers know that the organised proletariat is firmly decided to answer the order for moblisation by insurrection, we shall be able to sleep quietly; when that day comes, we shall be quite sure that in case of conflict of interests, the rulers of the different countries will know where to find the justice of the peace who resides at The Hague, and to submit their differences to international arbitration. It is the one and only means,

the only practicable and infallible means of curing governments of their warlike inclinations.

But to ensure that the masses take the manly resolution to answer the order for mobilisation by revolt, they must be cured of all patriotic sentiment.

As long as the proletarian remains patriot, as long as he persists in cherishing a sentimental preference for the Country where chance caused him to be born, as long as he believes that his Country is better than the others, that she is so much better that he should give his life for her, so long will it be impossible to obtain from the proletariat the revolutionary resolutions which alone can put an end to international wars.

And the proletarat will remain patriotic; it will continue cheerfully to shed its blood for the defence of its present Country until we have shown it that it would have nothing to lose if its Country were annexed by a neighbouring country.

Such an annexation is not to be desired provided it could be only the result of a war where victors and vanquished have always a lot to suffer; but seeing that the French patriot Socialists wave before the French proletariat the spectre of the German Emperor, and the German patriot Socialists the spectre of the Czar of Russia, seeing that they have recourse for the needs of their cause to hypotheses as unlikely and as fantastic, we must not hesitate to follow them even on that ground.

Let us try, then, to see coolly what loss would accrue by a German annexation, not only to the French proletarians, but to the mass of small shopkeepers and land-owning peasants.

Do they run the risk of being massacred en masse? Everybody knows very well that they do not. For a long time past non-belligerents have, in Europe, been sheltered from such acts of ferocity; the time when the vanquished were massacred is long gone by.

Would they lose their property? Those who possess nothing, not even the right to work, have nothing to lose. As for the small landed proprietors and the small shopkeepers, would a change of Country take away from them their parcels of land or their small businesses? Does, in the twentieth century, a war amongst Europeans involve such consequences? When annexing Alsace, did the Germans take the fields, the houses, the shops, the factories of the Alsacians? As a matter of fact, after the annexation, the large manufacturers remained large manufacturers, the small shopkeepers, remained small shopkeepers, the small landowners remained small landowners, and the beggars remained beggars.

Would they lost their mother tongue? Nonsense! Two centuries after English annexation, the French-Canadians speak French; the Poles of Germany, in spite of the persistent efforts of their vanquishers to Germanise them, speak Polish; in 1870, two centuries after the annexation of Alsace by Louis XIV., the Alsacians spoke a German patois; in spite of centuries of Russian domination, they continue to use German in the Russian provinces of the Baltic. The vanquished only lose their mother tongue when they wish to, or when they have some interest in doing so, and even then

it is a work of centuries. What a great misfortune, indeed, for a group of men to unlearn, little by little, in the space of thirty or forty generations, a rich idiom, to learn another quite as rich?

Would they lose their temperament, their personality, the originality of their race, providing race characteristics be as pronounced as they like to make out? It is no more likely. Let half of Germany be annexed to-morrow, and the annexed Germans would nevertheless remain Germans with all the qualities and all the defects of their race, with their methodical disciplined spirit, their ardour for work, a certain heaviness of mind, and an exaggerated worship of force and authority. If to-morrow half of France were annexed to Germany, the annexed French would nevertheless remain Frenchmen, with all the qualities and all the defects of their temperament, their vivacity of spirit, their ironical rapture, a certain artistic taste, and also their light-headedness, their lack of seriousness and their indiscipline, if, that is to say, those are really the native qualities and the real faults of the two races, which is not at all demonstrated.

Would they take away the superioity of their political form? There can be very little superiority of political form when unequal political institutions cover the same economic organisation. Rich bourgeois, more or less leaning towards Socialism, for whom the food question is solved, may attach to it a capital importance; proletarians living in the insecurity of the morrow have the right to attach but a secondary importance to it.

Besides, we have seen that the political differences between republican France, monarchical Germany, England, and Italy, are not as great as the republican bourgeoisie of France or our French patriot Socialists would make then out to be. They bewilder the French proletarians with the idea of a German annexation by telling them, without a smile, that once German subjects they would find themselves deprived of their liberties of thought, of meeting, of the Press, of their trade union liberties.

This is a poor joke.

They would have very nearly the same liberty of thought as in France; they would read their Socialist papers as in France; they would go to their political meetings as in France; they would see there on the platform the police officer, more often than in France it is true, but as he is sometimes still seen in France, as a thousand hearers could see him in the year of our Lord 1904 in France, at St. Etienne, under a Socialist municipality, in a town which sends to Parliament three Socialist deputies, they would learn from time to time that one of their propagandists has been sued in the law courts, as in France; they would go to barracks as in France; they would unite themselves in their trade unions as in France; they would strike as in France; the police would "move them on" as in France, and if the police were powerless, the army would shoot them down as in France.

Under German rule, as under French rule, the proletarians changing their Country would meet with the same insolent and rapacious master class,

the same administration hard on the small man, the same officers, and the same haughty non-commissioned officers, the same law courts pitiless to the poor, with from time to time, as in France, a humane master, an intelligent officer and a just magistrate.

The French proletariat would lose nothing by it, not even honour.

Besides, what honour are they talking about when they tell us that we would be dishonoured by becoming Germans, that there are cases when one must fight for dignity, for honour? Yes, what honour?

National honour? There is no national honour where there is no national sentiment, and the class spirit has killed all national sentiment that ever was in us.

Is it our honour of man, our personal dignity, which commands us to oppose ourselves to all aggression, to all violence of any group of men upon the group to which we belong? It is precisely our personal dignity which forbids us to fight for interests which are not ours.

The anti-patriots could have no honour in such a matter since they have not the same conception of honour as have the patriots. The patriots would deem it dishonourable not to answer an order for mobilisation in case of war, and we would dishonour ourselves by answering it.

Ludovic Halévy writes in one of his novels:—

> During the last Franco-German war one morning at Etretat, they beat to arms in the streets of the small town. All men were summoned to proceed to Havre.

> The troop of summoned men, some wearing smock-frocks, others wearing jackets, marches off to the beating of a single drummer who beats the step, very proud of his marital appearance, when going through the villages.
>
> But while passing through one of them a woman comes out of her house. Furious, she inveighs against the men: Cowards! cowards! What cowards men must be to let themselves be taken to war!

That woman of the people had some honour—the same conception as the anti-patriot Socialists who also have their individual pride, but who do not use it in order to allow themselves to be led to the slaughterhouse like a herd of sheep, for interests which are not their own.

In short, all the French proletariat would have to lose by a German annexation would be a small political superiority; and that loss would not be without compensation. It would be compensated for by the fall of a frontier; it would be compensated for by the possibility of its giving a hand to the German proletariat in its constant struggle against its Kaiser.

Ah, they threaten us with William II.'s boot! If we really are, as the French patriot Socialists will have it, politically more advanced than the German people—well! we will help them to get rid of their Kaiser and his boot; we will teach them to sneer at his police and his sword-danglers.

Likewise the German proletariat would have almost nothing to lose from annexation by Russia: an hypothesis at least as fantastic as that of an annexation of France by Germany. It need not fear that it will fall back again into barbarism, for

such a retrogression at the present moment is impossible.

It is impossible, not only because it will take Czarism many years before it can recoup its military forces and become menacing again, not only because autocracy is so strongly shaken in Russia itself that, as everybody knows, it will soon be driven to political reforms which will close up the gulf which separates it from the rest of civilised Europe, but it is also, above all, impossible because it is not within the power of any human force, of any administrative compulsion, of any boot, of any knout, to transform the Germans, who are already intellectually polished and politically half emancipated, into poor moujiks, who can be led by beating with the knout or by icons.

We must never be tired of repeating that the political institutions of Czarist Russia are breaking up everywhere at this moment; first because the capitalist régime which has made its appearance there cannot accommodate itself to the ancient political forms of Asiatic despotism, but also because the Muscovite ogre has not been able to digest the bits of Finland and Poland which it gluttonously swallowed a century ago, and which are choking it at this moment. What would happen, then, if it had had the misfortune to swallow something more indigestible and still less assimilable than Finland or Poland, a piece of that Germany accustomed for centuries like France to a regular government, and to a relatively enlightened administration?

Since they want the French proletariat to "march" by frightening it with the fear of a German annexation, and the German proletariat with the fear of a Russian annexation, it remains for us to show the German people and the French people that that bogey ought not to make them shiver.

Hitherto the patriot Socialists have said to the masses: "Our Country is not nice, but she has a glorious past; she is indispensable to human progress; she is the common property of all her children, even of the disinherited."

We must talk otherwise to them, we must say to them, and say it over and over again:—

The proletarians have no Country.

The differences which exist between the present Countries are all superficial differences.

The capitalist régime is the same in all Countries; and as it cannot work without a minimum of political liberties, all Countries which live under a capitalist system enjoy elementary liberties which cannot anywhere be denied any longer to the proletariat. Even in Russia, the autocratic régime is to-day beaten to death.

The proletarians who give their lives for the present Countries are dupes, stupid brutes.

Even when their Country is victorious it is they who pay the cost of victory through increased taxes.

The only war which is not a deception is that at the end of which, if they are victors, proletarians may hope by the expropriation of the capitalist class to put their hands on the social wealth accumulated by human genius for generations past.

There is one war only which is worthy of intelligent men, it is civil war, social revolution.

And as the masses understand nothing of the abstract language of metaphysics, as it is necessary in order to be heard by them to speak a concrete language, we must not hesitate to point out to them plainly that we have no national sentiment left, to proclaim that it is a matter of indifferene to us whether we be Frenchmen, Germans, Englishmen, Italians, or Russians.

If we seriously want to advance the coming of the United States of Europe, it is necessary henceforth to boldly proclaim that we are neither Germans, nor Frenchmen, nor Englishmen, nor Italians, nor Russians, but Europeans, or, better, the countrymen of all the exploited of the earth.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Anti-Patriot Socialists and the Question of Citizen Armies.

All Socialist programmes contain an article calling for citizen armies in substitution for permanent armies.

There is but one country in the world which possesses a citizen army analogous to that which Socialists ask for. It is Switzerland; in which country the future soldiers are selected and drilled in their own homes, on Sundays, from 17 to 20 years of age. As recruits at the regiment they have only to perform certain indispensable military drill. Thanks to the suppression of parades and useless guards, they need only detain them 45 or 50 days with the Colours in all arms except cavalry. Mounted men remain 90 days, but the State, by way of compensation for this supplementary service which it imposes upon them gives each man, in full ownership, his charger, leaving to him the responsibility of keeping it fit for a campaign. They go back to their homes with their

uniforms and their arms. They only need cartridges, some of which are distributed amongst them for shooting practices which are held in the villages, without great cost to the State, and without great trouble to the men. They are called up for five periods of sixteen days each, which is found sufficient to allow of the instruction of the men and the officers, all of whom come out of the ranks.

In the twinkling of an eye, all these citizen soldiers, with their uniforms, their arms, and their horses at hand, can mobilise themselves; no permanent army is capable of carrying out its mobilisation so rapidly.

The great annual manœuvres of the Swiss Army allow competent men like Captain Moch of the French Artillery, to affirm that an army of citizen soldiers so understood, in no way gives place, in professional value, to any permanent army.

That is the ideal army which patriot Socialists in every country dream of, awaiting the day when people will be able to do without even the citizen army.

Must anti-patriot internationalists combat the idea of citizen armies, and lead a campaign in favour of complete disarmament, by asking, or even without asking, for reciprocal action from neighbouring Governments?

Go and ask French or foreign rulers to disarm, when they need the army for maintaining their privileges against the enemy within their gates! It would be just as well to ask them to commit suicide or to give up ownership of the instruments of work. The menace of Socialism compels them,

on pain of disappearance, to keep at hand a considerable armed force. The ruling classes feel nearly as much repugnance at accepting a system of citizen armies which would be an infinitely less docile instrument in their hands than a permanent army. One may be sure they will do their utmost in every country to reconstitute everywhere professional armies in the day when they feel they can no longer reckon, for the repression of strikes and workers' risings, upon permanent armies whose periods of service are becoming more and more reduced. But it is not certain that they will succeed. The peasants are at heart so anti-militarist, they profess such a holy dislike for the barracks, that even without having become Socialists, they will help by their ballot papers the urban proletariat who will ask for the institution of the citizen army.

Thus the substitution of citizen armies for permanent armies, unlike complete disarmament, does not appear to be a reform absolutely impossible to bring about under a capitalist régime.

Such a reform would not be at all contemptible, whatever the communist anarchists may declare to the contrary. One must not turn up one's nose at a reform that would reduce military service from two years to 45 or 50 days, and which at the same time would undoubtedly tend to reduce military expenditure.

Moreover, a citizen army would be infinitely less dangerous for the strikers or the insurgents than the present permanent armies; it can even be affirmed that if in France the system of citizen armies were substituted for the present one of per-

manent armies, the capitalist régime would not last ten years, at any rate in the great working-class districts. The day the capitalist bourgeoisie are reduced to levying regiments of citizen soldiers from rural districts for the repression of strikes or insurreactionary movements in working-class centres will be an ill one for them; the strikers would lose no time in taking their rifles and seizing an ammunition depot. Those who object that in Switzerland, the ruling class succeeds perfectly well in curbing the strikers with the aid of the citizen soldiers, forget that Switzerland is above all an agricultural country where there is no great working-class district; whereas in France, Germany, and Italy, there are great industrial centres with which the peasant forces could not easily cope.

It is not a bad thing either that militant Socialists should keep in mind the citizen army. The country which first reaches Socialism by a violent revolution will probably have to drive back the attacks of the neighbouring bourgeoisies; the Socialists of that country, having something to defend that day, will perhaps be very glad to know of a defensive system less expensive, less absorbing and as efficient as that of permanent armies.

Finally, there are still in Asia-Minor, in Central Asia, and in the heart of China, populations whom a religious movement may to-morrow launch upon civilised Europe, with the same fury as the Huns of the fifth century. It may be the same to us to be English, French, German, Italian. An annexation of France to Germany would not bring about the massacre of the French, whereas an invasion

of Asiatic hordes might end in a general slaughter. Improbable as such an event may be, it must be foreseen, and measures must be taken to deal with it.

Thus there is no inconvenience—and there are even several advantages—for the Socialist Party to endeavour to wrest from Parliament the organisation of the citizen army.

There is no inconvenience whatever, with a double condition, however: first, it must be well understood that our agitation in favour of a citizen army does not in any way imply our intention of defending the present Countries against politically and economically equivalent Countries; and again, that this question of citizen armies remains for the Socialist Party a secondary question by the side of that other more urgent and important one: the attitude of the Party in case of war.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Refusal of Military Service in Time of Peace.

In January, 1902, the court-martial of the 7th Army Corps, sat at Besançon, to try Gunner Grasselin, of the 9th Artillery Battalion, who refused to learn the noble calling of arms.

A great Conservative newspaper reported the cross-examination of Grasselin, as follows:—

> Q. On November 18th, 1901, four days after your joining the regiment, you refused to obey your captain, who ordered you to open the breech of a cannon?
>
> A. I did not refuse. I said I could not.
>
> Q. Why could you not?
> Silence.
>
> Q. They have read out to you the code of military justice?
>
> A. Yes, Colonel.

Q. On November 19th, the next day, when the same order was given to you, you again refused to execute it. The following days you took the same attitude. They have read out the penal code to you as many as five times. Plain request, warning, threatening with punishment, nothing succeeded in overcoming your obstinacy. Why did you act like that?

A. Jesus Christ said: "Thou shalt not kill. Let us love one another." I did not want to injure others.

Q. To open a breech is not injuring anybody. (Smiles.)

A. But later on they would have given me a gun; the gun serves for killing just as the share of the plough serves for tilling.

Q. Finally, you had not to discuss; you were given an order.

A. Above my superiors, who are but men, there is Christ.

Q. Christ does not command you to disobey the laws of your Country.

The president of the court-martial comes back to Crasselin's refusal to bear arms, and asks him what he would do if he were attacked.

A. I would not defend myself.

Q. Why?

A. In order not to kill.

Q. What would you do?

A. I would run away. (Laughter.)

Q. And if somebody came to set your parents' house on fire, or to attempt to assassinate your father, your mother or your brothers?

A. I would try to prevent them.

Q. How?

A. Without beating them.

Q. By looking at them? Then, you don't want to make war?

A. No.

Q. Do you agree at least to submit to the law?

A. Not for killing. Let them make me do something else.

Q. Will you open the breeches now?

A. I would like to promise, but I would not keep it. I *could* not keep it. It is not insubordination, it is submission to my conscience.

Q. Your conscience ought to command you to obey your chiefs, as all other Frenchmen do.

Gunner Grasselin was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

A few weeks before, the same court-martial sentenced for the same reason infantryman Delsol, of the 37th Line Regiment.

In Holland and in Hungary, similar cases of refusal of military service have occurred. These acts of revolt are almost always features of Christian Socialists, who apply the evangelical principle, preached by Tolstoy, of non-resistance to evil by violence.

In a few cases, however, that resistance has been inspired not by Christian sentiments but by Socialist revolutionary sentiments; certain refractories have refused to serve because they had nothing to defend in the present Countries, and that they would not in any way contribute to their defence either against the enemies within, or against the enemies beyond the frontier.

There is not one revolutionary who does not respect very deeply the men of heart who have the courage, in the midst of general cowardice, to stand up thus alone against all, against social prejudices and public force intrusted with the powers of com-

pulsion. There is not one who, if he ponders over those acts of revolt, could consider them as useless: an act of revolt, when inspired by such considerations, especially an act of revolt against the most formidable incarnation of brutal force, is never useless.

It is impossible that acts like those of Delsol and Grasselin do not set thinking even the unconscious brutes who accept military service quite naturally, without thought of evil or with the resignation of dumb animals accustomed to the yoke.

"If in my regiment there were two hundred like me," said Grasselin to his judges, "you would be in an awkward predicament."

Undoubtedly. But is it to be expected that the example of Delsol and Grasselin will find favour to any extent, and, above all, is it desirable that such an attitude should spread?

It is highly improbable that the example of Grasselin will prove contagious either in Christian circles, or in Socialist revolutionary circles.

Christianity has been dead in France a long time, and in most countries of Europe, at least that evangelical Christianity which Tolstoy so painfully tries to revive. In France, for instance, sincere and enthusiastic Catholics are numerous, but between evangelical Christianity and their Catholicism there is but a certain verbalism in common: evangelical Christianity as understood by Tolstoy is a subversive doctrine, whereas Catholicism has become long ago, and remains more and more, a force of bourgeois conservation; the need for clerical domination, its secular influ-

ence upon the rich classes, naturally conservative, the sheep-like spirit of the great mass of the faithful, and the absence of a critical mind which their Catholic education so well explains, stand in the way of hoping that the real Christian behaviour of Grasselin will meet with many imitators in Catholic circles.

And amid Protestants there are also too few Christians, and far too many clericals for us to expect many amongst them to seek the wreath of martyrdom.

It is only in countries of dense ignorance and naïve faith like Russia that one can see in the twentieth century entire populations like the Doukhobors submitting to persecution en masse, in order to uphold a religious ideal. Not before a miracle has revived in the civilised countries of Europe the faith which removes mountains must one count upon evangelical Christianity becoming a serious hindrance for the military authorities.

Ought the example of Grasselin to be recommended in the Socialist revolutionary centres?

In spite of the sympathy we can feel for Grasselin and his emulators, and in spite of the useful impression his act of revolt may produce upon the masses, it must be answered without hesitation in the negative.

First, Grasselin's views would have the grave inconvenience of alienating from us all fathers and mothers, who would dread the effects of our preaching for their children.

Then again, one can but honestly recommend what one has done oneself, or what one is willing

to do on occasion; but where are the Socialist orators who have themselves refused to carry the knapsack?

Finally, the game is not worth the candle. The propaganda resulting from an act of revolt like that of Grasselin, great as it may be supposed to be, is too dearly paid for when it costs its author a long imprisonment which tears him away from a centre where his presence would otherwise be so useful.

The Socialist soldiers have better things to do than to get themselves imprisoned in order that their action should serve for propaganda. They must, on the contrary, remain in the ranks. The barracks, thanks to many officers and non-commissioned officers, is a ground most favourable for anti-militarist propaganda. Let Socialist conscripts avail themselves of it for propagating Socialism and Internationalism.

They must be in the ranks the day a strike breaks out, in order to explain to their comrades of the mess the legitimacy of the workers' claims; to induce them to bear patiently the inoffensive missiles of strikers who have got nervous by privations or driven to desperation by the masters; and to urge hesitating comrades to put the butts of their rifles upside down.

Most certainly if in one regiment there were two hundred Grasselins, the military authority would be very uneasy; but if there were two hundred revolutionaries in each regiment at the moment of a strike or of a popular insurrection, two hundred revolutionaries holding rifles and ammunition and decided upon using them if need

be in favour of the insurrectionists, the embarrassment of the authority would perhaps be still greater.

Hence the Countryless who refuses to be a soldier, does well; but he who enters the barracks with the firm resolution of behaving as a soldier of Socialism, does a hundred times better.

CHAPTER XIX.

In Case of War.

What is our action to be in case of war?

It is shameful to think that a great Party like ours, a Party which calls itself internationalist and revolutionary, has hitherto been afraid to look this problem in the face.

Because they have not dared to face it, no precautions have been taken in view of such an important event; and this is what we are exposed to. Let war break out to-morrow, and there will be moaning on both sides of the frontier, there will be damning of the Government, there will be shaking of fists, there will be launching of passionate proclamations, but—they will march.

They will go reluctantly, but they will go.

Well! there must be no going, and we will but obtain that result, if, beforehand, in time of peace, we can coolly take our bearings.

The Party must first clearly say in its Congresses, so that the Delcassé's, the William II.'s, and the capitalist classes of whom they are the

business agents, hear as well, that we shall not march, whoever be the aggressor.

The Party must then draw its plan of mobilisation with method: civil war, no more than foreign war can be improvised. It is not sufficient to know where one goes, one must know by what practical means one can attain the end.

Now there are two methods which commend themselves to the attention of the Internationalist Party.

The first is by far the simplest: at the time of mobilisation the reservists would rejoin their regiments, would let themselves be armed, and then, once armed, would not only refuse to go, but would seize public powers and instruments of work, whose management they would put into the hands of the local Bourse du Travail.*

This tactic bristles with almost insurmountable difficulties: first, the military authorties, warned, would use caution; or they would closely watch the leaders, arrest them, and get them executed before they could have won over those of weaker resolve; or they would embark everybody, taking good care not to distribute cartridges until in the proximity of the battlefield.

But the greatest difficulty would not arise from the measures of caution that the military authorities could take in such an event. It depends upon the

---

* Bourse du Travail: The law of 1884 empowers every municipality in France to erect buildings for the housing of trade unions; they are called "Bourses du Travail," or Labour Exchanges, and provide the necessary rooms for trade unions free of any charge, the cost and upkeep being borne by the community.

state of mind in which the reservists who would have answered the order for mobilisation would find themselves by the sole fact of their return to military life. Once in the regiment, the most determined man would again receive the impression of being no more than a number, a cog in a gigantic machine which involves one willy-nilly, breaking all individual will. Some time would be necessary for one to recover possession of oneself again; but the military authorities would leave no time for it: the cannon-flesh would be taken on to the battlefield before it could have looked round. Moreover, arriving in a town where one would feel oneself, a stranger, posted into a regiment by the side of comrades whom one would perhaps not know, and whom one would distrust, half of the assurance and the resolution, which are so necessary to accomplish an act of grave revolt, would be lost.

Another plan, fortunately, offers itself to international Socialists which presents fewer difficulties. It can be put into two words: desertion of the comrades under the flag, and strike of the reservists.

The day war is declared, the duty of Socialists under the flag would be to desert. If they had been able, as in their duty, to make some acquaintancees in their garrison town amongst the militant Socialists and trade unionists of the place, nothing would be easier to them.

As much as the advice to desert in time of peace would alienate from us the mass of parents, so much would the advice to desert in time of war gain us the sympathies of the fathers and mothers, how-

ever little our Socialist and Internationalist propaganda may have touched upon them.

Once the sons were sheltered, it would be for the fathers, the old ones, the reservists, not to go and put themselves in the wolf's mouth but to remain in their homes. So long as they are not called up, the reservist remains a free citizen who could not be easily torn from his family circle. Who, then, could tear him away from it by force, either in the working-class centres or in the country?

The standing army? Diminished by the desertions, it would be on the road to the slaughter-house. There would remain the gendarmerie, but a lovely sight it would be to see the gendarmes trying to collar the refractories during a strike if they had not an army in reserve, ready to lend a helping hand. The gendarmerie would have enough to do in the great working-class districts, for from the passive resistance of the reservists' strike, the working class would have soon passed on to open resistance, to insurrection, and the latter would have much more chance of triumphing now that the active army had gone away to the frontier.

Between the two plans it is for the Socialist Party to decide in its congresses; once it has adopted one, it will be the duty of all revolutionaries to conform to its discipline.

The day a war breaks out the mobilisation of the Countryless must be made without wavering, "without hesitation or murmur," as says the theory which the perfect soldier bears engraved in his heart.

CHAPTER XX.

The Question of the Attitude of Socialists in Case of War at the Congresses of Brussels (1891) and of Zurich (1893).

At the Congress of Brussels, the question of the attitude of Socialists in case of war was put clearly by the Dutch Socialist Party.

A commission was nominated, composed of the delegates of all countries represented at the congress, to give a report on militarism and internationalism, and one of the Dutch delegates to that commission, Domela Nieuwenhuis, presented, in the name of the Dutch section of the International, the following proposal:—

> Considering:
>
> That national divergencies are never in the interest of the proletariat, but in that of its oppressors;
>
> Considering that all modern wars, exclusively brought about by the capitalist class in its own interest, are in its hands a means of breaking the strength of the revolutionary movement and consolidating the bourgeois supremacy by the continuation of most shameful exploitation;

DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS.

Considering that no government can plead as a valid excuse that it has been provoked, seeing that war is the result of the international will of capitalism :

The International Working-class Socialist Congress of Brussels declares that Socialists of all countries will answer the proposal for a war by an appeal to the people to proclaim the general strike.

The majority of the commission rejected that proposal and declared for the following motion :—

The Congress,

Declares that militarism, which crushes Europe, is the fatal result of the permanent state of open or latent war, imposed upon society by the régime of exploitation of man by man, and the class struggle which is its consequence ;

Affirms that all attempts having as their object the abolition of militarism and the advent of peace amongst peoples—however generous their intentions—could not be but Utopian and powerless, if they do not reach the economic sources of the evil ;

That the creation of a Socialist order alone will, by putting an end to the exploitation of man by man, abolish militarism and assure definite peace ;

That consequently the duty and the interest of all those who desire the abolition of war, is to join the International Socialist Party which is the real and unique Party of Peace.

In consequence the Congress,

In presence of the European situation, every day more menacing, and in face of the Chauvinist excitations of the ruling classes of the different countries, appeals to all workers to protest, by an incessant agitation against all incentives, to war and the alliances which favour them, and to hasten, by the development of the international organisation of the proletariat, the triumph of Socialism ;

Declares that it is the only possible means of avoiding the catastrophe of a general war, of which the workers would have to bear all the costs.

> And intends, in any case before history and humanity, to throw upon the ruling classes the responsibility of all that may happen.

The majority nominated two of its members: one, Liebknecht, of German nationality; the other Vaillant, of French nationality, to report upon this second proposal.

Here is, according to the analytical return published by the secretariat of the Belgian Workers' Party, the debate which took place during a full sitting of the Congress:—

> Liebknecht, who spoke first, declared that the Commission was almost unanimous. There was no division between Frenchmen and Germans. It had not to be feared that French Socialists are animated with a desire for revenge against Germany; no mention was made of it, not a word was said about it. The question of Alsace-Lorraine was not a Socialist question.
>
> There were proposals for provoking, in case of war, the strike and military insurrection. They were made by delegates whose countries did not bear the crushing weight of militarism borne by the nations having an absolute military régime; those proposals were put aside.
>
> A project was submitted to the effect that in all countries May-Day be not only Labour Celebration Day, but also that of the fraternity of peoples.
>
> A Socialist Congress could not take on that subject the attitude of a bourgeois philanthropist Congress. There was a war which was ever-present—the class war—and the war between peoples was but an aspect of it. The enemy of the German worker was not the French citizen, but the German bourgeois. On the contrary, the French proletarian was his ally. The German bourgeoisie would like disarmament, but it needed its enormous permanent army to resist the German proletariat. (Lively cheers.)
>
> A war, compared to which that of 1870 will be but a child's play, was menacing the world, and might put

civilisation back for a century. The proletariat must prevent it by an incessant propaganda, in order to save the world that fearful catastrophe, by assuring the triumph of Socialism. The only guarantee against the disasters of militarism resided in the Socialist organisation.

This speech was warmly cheered.

Vaillant, renewing Liebknecht's declaration, said there could have been no question in the Commission of territorial matters. Socialism indeed, by its advent, would assure each country its autonomy, with the right of disposing of itself.

The suppression of permanent armies must be attained. The Paris Congress had pronounced two years ago for the armed nation as a transitory measure.

Militarism must be condemned absolutely, and the reason why it is being condemned made known. It was the capitalist régime which everywhere maintained a state of war between the classes, as between the peoples.

There was no need to tabulate the evils caused by militarism such as crushing taxes, the barrack system, the demoralisation which were the results of it. Proletarians were embarracked to maintain the servitude of the factory, so that by fighting capitalism we fought militarism. The workers must hate the Chauvinist manœuvres which were designed to serve as a stumbling-block to the solution of the social question. Their duty was to attack alliances contracted by bourgeois governments in order to maintain the existing order of affairs. The triple alliance was condemnable, but they must strike particularly at the French Chauvinists who, grotesque and criminal, even to Cæsarian traditions, by a monstrous union had prostituted the Republic to the Czar, hanger of Nihilists.

In 1870, peace was proclaimed in Paris whilst in the Reichstag the German Socialists were protesting against the crushing of France. Socialism had grown since then. There must be no means left untried to prevent war; it ought to be shown, if need be, by acts,

that Socialists would oppose war to the end. The particular attitude to be taken could not be prescribed to the Socialists of every country.

A general resolution condemning militarism, but leaving to everyone the choice of the means to be used to fight it, was thus submitted to the vote. It was also understood that not only would it henceforth be attacked by every possible means of agitation and propaganda, but that on the day war was declared Socialists would all do their duty.

Great cheering greeted the end of this declaration.

The president now proposed the closure of the discussion, and the taking of the vote on the resolution. The majority of Congressists agreed, but marks of protests were heard, especially from the Dutch delegates.

Domela Nieuwenhuis, in the name of Holland, said the debate could not be stopped, and that the Dutch Socialists had to introduce and defend a resolution containing ideas which must be allowed to be freely put forth. The closure was, therefore, rejected by the majority of the meeting.

The debate started again on the main point of the question, and the proposal of the Dutch delegation.

Domela Nieuwenhuis began by criticising the proposal of the Commission. He said :—

It is easy to obtain unanimity in an assembly; all that is necessary is to introduce a proposal put down in terms which are very vague, and, therefore, have no meaning.

The proposal of the Commission is couched in this fashion. The Pope could accept it if one word were altered, that of Socialism into that of Christianity. The last sentence of the resolution throws upon the ruling class, before humanity and history, the responsibility of future wars. It cannot be moved by such a platitudinous protest. It throws the same responsibility upon the labouring class. It reminds one of two urchins quarrelling, and each blaming the other while the spectators laugh at their expense.

One must always tell the truth to one's friends. There are, to our mind, no international sentiments extolled by the Socialism of our German brethren. There has been great excitement everywhere amongst Socialists consequent upon the famous article of Vollmar.* (Protests from the benches of the German delegation.)

One cannot help thinking that this is a danger for the Party. Chauvinism must be rejected everywhere, as also any distinction between offensive and defensive wars. The diplomatists, if they wish it, declare any war upon which they have decided.

Passive resistance is most efficacious. For instance, Napoleon's whole energy did not succeed in breaking the resistance of the "Polsbrookers," who refused to serve in the army. When a rifle was put into their hands they dropped it. At last they had to be relegated to the ambulances.

It must not be forgotten that governments have a much more ferocious hatred against Socialists than they have against one another, even when they are at war. Socialists must not kill one another for the governments. By refusing to fight, all that may happen to them is to risk to be put to death, whereas if they go to battle they are sure to be killed.

Working men begin to think; their sons enter the armies. The result is that the ruling classes already feel their power shaking. It must be said frankly that civil war between proletariat and bourgeoisie is to be preferred to war between nations. The decision of war ought not to be in the hands of governments, but in those of the peoples, they who will not have war.

It is necessary to struggle against militarism, which is one of the means capitalism uses for maintaining its supremacy. It sustains itself but by bayonets; when

* Vollmar, the leader of the Bavarian Socialist Party and one of the most popular speakers of German Social-Democracy, had just been publishing an article of a strong nationalist internationalism.

their wielders become intelligent, the bourgeois order is lost. Frederick the Great said that if his soldiers thought not one would remain in the ranks.

The triumph of the proletariat will mean universal peace. By showing courage, energy and perseverance, war will never break out again. Governments, by declaring war, commit a revolutionary act; peoples have the right, and even the duty, to answer it by revolution.

This speech was very enthusiastically cheered.

Vaillant, one of the two committee reporters answered Domela Nieuwenhuis as follows :—

The wording of the proposal submitted by the Commission to the Congress was adopted, after a debate showing the impossibility of arriving at another wording.

There are nations finding themselves in special circumstances. The delegates who belong to those countries, and who are open and resolute opponents of war, cannot, under pain of getting into trouble and difficulties when they get home, but agree to a text very clear, but which suits everybody. They want to do all that is possible to prevent war, like the Dutch delegation, isolated in the Commision, not by words alone, but by acts. The proposal submitted to the assembly by the majority of the Commission, leaves it to Socialists of all nationalities to act as they like for the maintenance of peace by taking any action they wish against war, if it should break out in consequence of double or triple alliances made by bourgeois governments.

The voting on this question ought to be unanimous, so that the understanding of Socialists can be established. Precisely by the manner it is put, it allows of the adhesion of all nationalities.

President Mille now gave the word to Liebknecht, also a committee's reporter. A few protests emanated from the Dutch delegation and from a few French delegates, asking for the closure.

Liebknecht explained that the Germans having been attacked in Domela Nieuwenhuis' speech, it had to be answered and the facts re-established. On an inter-

ruption of Domela Nieuwenhuis asking whether he could answer, and on the president answering in the affirmative, the incident closed. Permission to proceed was now granted to Liebknecht.

Liebknecht recalled that Domela Nieuwenhuis had asserted that if the word Socialism was replaced in the proposed resolution by that of Christianity, the Pope could accept it. It was news to him that the Pope had pronounced for the class war.

The Dutch delegate had attacked the proposal, declaring it to be a tissue of phrases. There were no phrases in the report, but if phrasing was the pronunciation of big words, containing no realisable ideas, the general strike opposed to a declaration of war was phraseology.

The revolution of which the Dutch speaker has spoken so much, was not to be announced; when one really wanted it, one would do it. It was the same with many different things which one executes, but which one does not predict in advance.

Domela Nieuwenhuis had remarked that at the moment of the declaration of war, peoples had to be encouraged to the military strike. Those who would make that appeal would have no time to execute their project, for they would be taken and shot before they could act. It was thus Utopian to believe in the possibility of realising that means.

The attacks directed against German Socialists were unjust. They were no Chauvinists as they were reproached; they were less so than any other Socialists. The German Socialist Party had proved, in divers circumstances, that it was not stained with Chauvinism.

In 1870, during the war, German Socialists had combated it at the price of their liberty and their lives. They had suffered that time, leader and rank and file, for their ideas, as it often happened to them, for they knew how to sacrifice themselves for Socialism and their convictions.

In certain countries, like Holland, one was not well situated to pronounce oneself against war; if it broke

out, the situation was not the same as for those nations exposed to conflicts. It was otherwise difficult to carry on open propaganda against war in countries like France and Germany, where millions of combatants can, at a given moment, be thrown upon one another.

Instead of ceaselessly talking of revolution, it was better to work for the amelioration of the lot of the proletariat, and to fortify the workers' organisation. That was how one could best serve the popular cause.

Domela Nieuwenhuis had spoken of Chauvinism, one could tell him that he had been a Chauvin.

An ironical interruption of Domela Nieuwenhuis was heard; the German committee-reporter momentarily interrupted, and went on to say that Dutch Socialism would not laugh any longer when he had spoken.

In 1870, when German Socialists tried to stop war, whilst several of them were compromised, a Dutch journal, edited by Domela Nieuwenhuis violently attacked the German Social-Democrats; there was some most detestable Chauvinism. An attempt must be made to arrive at a formula which allowed all to adhere to it; that of the Commission was of the kind required, the resolution of the Dutch delegation being unacceptable and absurd. The Congress would do its duty by accepting the proposal of the Commission. These words were received with lengthy cheering.

The president next announced that Domela Nieuwenhuis, having asked to speak in order to answer personal attacks, be granted permission readily, especially as he was put down to reply to the committee-reporters.

Domela Nieuwenhuis declared that Liebknecht had accused him of uttering inexactitudes, but had not mentioned any. It had not been said that all German Socialists were Chauvins. Accusing a man of being a liar without providing the proof was not a proceeding worthy of the dignity of a man like Liebknecht; neither was it conducive to the dignity of a man like Domela Nieuwenhuis to answer them.

The truth was that it had been stated that amongst the German Social-Democracy there were Chauvinists.

Facts had been mentioned, and Vollmar's article indicated.

Volders (Belgium) here interrupted remarking that there are Chauvins like Vollmar in all countries.

Domela Nieuwenhuis went on to express the opinion that it is not necessary to extol the sacrifices which the German Socialists have done for their convictions.

All Socialist parties have endured persecutions and sufferings for the cause of the people. It is better not to glorify oneself at meetings, but to content oneself with having done one's duty.

He terminated amid cheering, joining himself, in the name of the Dutch delegates, to the amendment proposed by the English delegation. That amendment was worded as follows :—

The Congress,

Recommends the workers of the different countries to oppose to the declaration of war an appeal to the people in favour of a general strike, awaiting the regulation of wars by international arbitration, and invites Members of Parliament to introduce bills reducing the budgets of war.

Jean Volders (of the Belgium Socialist Party) explained that the difficulty of finding a wording acceptable to the majority of nations and of the Congress, was not the outcome of a difference of opinion, but of situation and facts. It followed from the reciprocal positions of two of the great countries represented, that their delegates could only accept resolutions which, whilst leaving the greatest latitude to Socialists of other nations, like themselves, do not involve them in grave inconveniences.

The proposal on which the Commission had succeeded in agreeing had the great advantage of allowing each Socialist Party to act in its own country according to special circumstances and its tactics. For instance, it was possible for England as for other countries favouring Domela Nieuwenhuis's system to use the means advocated by the Dutch speaker. Each nationality retained the liberty and responsbility of its actions.

The Commission was satisfied to have accomplished an acceptable piece of work by obtaining from the Germans and from the French a declaration of solidarity in favour of the resolutions stigmatising and condemning war. It must not be forgotten when discussing the proposal which must, if the Congress wanted to accomplish a great work, be adopted by acclamation of the Assembly. (Loud cheers.)

Then the Congress passed on to the vote. The proposal of the Dutch delegation, amended by the English delegation, was put to the vote by nationality.

Germany, Austria, Belgium, America, Italy, Spain, Denmark, Hungary, Roumania, Poland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, voted against.

England, France and Holland voted for. Consequently the proposal was rejected.

The resolution proposed by the Commission was then put to the vote of nationality.

Holland abstained. The fifteen other countries adopted it; thirteen of them voted for it with the unanimity of their delegates.

Repeated rounds of applause greeted this vote.

Volders asked the Congress to ratify this resolution by acclamations. The vote had established the fact that we were all unanimous in recognising but one Mother Country—Humanity; one enemy only—Capitalism.

A thunder of applause followed this proposal.

Domela Nieuwenhuis remarked that the resolution of the section had not been unanimous.

The Dutch Socialist Party and Domela Nieuwenhuis were beaten.

Two years later, at the following International Congress, which was held at Zurich, they again introduced their proposal slightly modified, at any rate clarified.

At Brussels, the Socialist Party asked for the

general strike in case of war, which, after all, they considered as the beginning of the Revolution.

At Zurich, there was still talk of the general strike, but at the same time military strike was advocated—the latter, of course, understood in the sense of insurrection.

Here is the Dutch proposal put forward at Zurich:—

> The Congress invites the International Working-class Party to hold itself ready to answer immediately a declaration of war from the governments with a general strike everywhere where working men can exercise an influence upon war; and in the countries in question by the military strike.

This time, again, the majority of the Commission rejected this proposal, declaring it first unrealisable, and, further, anti-revolutionary, for if adopted "*the most Socialist country would be delivered defenceless to the most backward country, and the Cossack would reign over Europe.*"

To the Dutch proposal, the German section opposed its own, backed by the majority of the Commission.

It is worded as follows:—

> The position of the workers in case of war is laid down in a precise manner by the resolution of the Brussels Congress on militarism. The International Revolutionary Socialist Democracy in all countries must oppose with all its might the jingo appetites of the ruling classes; it must consolidate always closer the bonds of solidarity between workmen of all countries; it must work restlessly to vanquish capitalism which divides humanity into two great inimical camps, and provokes peoples against one another. With the suppression of class domination, war will also disappear.

> The fall of capitalism signifies universal peace. The représentatives of the workers' party in the deliberating assemblies must reject all military budgets; they must ceaselessly protest against permanent armies and call for disarmament. The whole Socialist Party must back up all associations which have as their aim universal peace.

No longer do we possess but a dry analysis of the debates, as in the case of the Congress of Brussels, but the shorthand reports of the principal speeches delivered at Zurich. Thus:—

> Domela Nieuwenhuis (Holland):—I have been called an imbecile, a revolutionary, and a fool. I share that shame with the Congress of Paris in 1871 (?) which brought forward the wishes I am formulating to-day.
>
> Our Dutch proposal may be bad, but let us discuss it. The German proposal says nothing, signifies nothing. It is one of those platitudinous sentences that the League of Peace takes for resolutions.
>
> It is so evident by itself that it is superfluous to vote it, whereas we Dutchmen put forward an efficient means, direct and practicable, to put a stop to war. You talk of the jingo appetites of the bourgeoisie, *but jingo appetites exist with the Socialists, alas! as with the bourgeois. Scrub the internationalist and you will find patriotism and national sentiment underneath.*
>
> So it is that we see a Bebel, in the midst of the Reichstag, declaring war upon Russia, the hereditary enemy! Oh, how, fifty years ago, was Heinrich Heine much less jingo than Bebel preaching the massacre of Russians! They frighten us with Cossacks as they threaten children with the bogey-man or the policeman: one would have thought it was Bismarck frightening his Reichstag.
>
> You say that Russia stands for barbarity. *Who can stop the republican French from saying that Germany stands for barbarity, and that she should be marched against?* Let us come back to the principles of

Socialism, to the fraternity of peoples. Besides, why threaten us with the invasion of barbarians? The invasion of barbarians is not always an evil, and the little civilisation we have got would not exist if the barbarians had not mixed their new blood with the impoverished and vitiated blood of the dying Græco-Roman world. In fact, the German chiefs are making concessions to militarism. Where is the time when Bebel said: "We shall neither give a man nor a penny"? *Take care that the habit of parliamentarism does not make you lose sight of the object!* When we talk of military strike we do not talk of men in active service who would be immediately repressed, but of soldiers of the reserve who would stop peacefully at home. How would the government have the time and the strength to arrest them, or room to lodge them in its prisons?

The example given in such a way by a few would be followed by the whole people who abhor military service; mobilisation would thus be rendered impossible. But then it will be civil war? Let it be so; we prefer civil war which will allow us to crush capitalism, the real enemy, instead of fighting our brethren, the foreign proletarians.

Further, the sole fear of that civil war will be sufficient to keep back those governments who might be tempted to unchain war against another country. As to the general strike which we advocate by the side of the military strike, it must spread in the first place to the railway and telegraph employees. Away with nebulous declarations; indicate a means better than ours. If not, vote unanimously the proposed means, and the princes will tremble on their thrones, and will think it over twice before they talk of war again.

Libeknecht (Germany):—I would not think of villifying our cause by bringing up here pettifogging personal questions, but I could not let pass the words of Domela Nieuwenhuis without answering them.

To say that the German Socialist Democracy has gone over to the cause of militarism and jingoism is to

say an untruth which we have refuted in advance by our words and by our acts. Against militarism we have not gone back a hair's breadth. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine? We have condemned it as a fault, we have described it as a crime. (Enthusiastic cheers.) I have said it in the Reichstag before military Germany, and I have repeated it before the people, I confirm it solemnly here before the assembled universal proletariat. This opinion we have paid for, my comrades and I, by years of prison, whose number, if added up, would reach a thousand! Not a man, not a penny! such was our programme. Since it exists we have not gratified the German army with either a man or a penny. (Enthusiastic cheers from the German delegation.) And when lately the German people were asked whether they wanted to continue in the path of militarism, it is thanks to us that the question was put, it is thanks to us that the majority of the German people answered that question in the negative. And now, let us leave personal questions, and let us get at principles.

Yes, if the Dutch proposal were realisable, we would vote for it with both hands. It is but a pious resolution, it is unrealisable.

If it were realisable, we would be the masters in the economical and political domain, and then there would be no more wars. But we have not reached that point yet. In neutral Holland, such a proposal could produce itself. It cannot take foot in militarist Germany. We are told our proposal is a phrase. I am afraid that is the case with yours. No; you will not struggle against the Moloch of militarism by gaining a few isolated individuals, by provoking puerile barrack riots: you would deliver to the Moloch a few wretches, you would give it a few more victims. What is wanted is untiring propaganda; it is our spirit that has to be implanted in the army. When the masses become Socialist, militarism will die. (Enthusiastic cheers from the German delegation.) That is what we Germans have worked for, what we are working for, what we will work for unceasingly. Here, before the representatives of the

international proletariat, we solemnly pledge ourselves to it.

Adler (Austria) comes to the rescue of Liebknecht :— How could Dutchmen declare war upon militarism? They have not any. The Swiss might follow the same error, but they are too reasonable to do it. Undoubtedly, the Dutch proposal is theoretically logical; it marks our intimate convictions, our deep aspirations. But on the day of realisation, the Dutch will remain isolated, for their point of view is narrow. Never let us lull people into absurd dreams, for it is a crime to promise what one knows one cannot keep.

Domela Nieuwenhuis :—You talk like M. de Caprivi.

Adler :—I wish indeed M. de Caprivi would talk as I do. You said the princes would tremble before the threat of a strike. I think they would laugh at it. Let those talk who can do nothing else : the past has shown those who have acted, the future will show those who can act.

Dejeante, in the name of the French delegation, came to uphold the general strike in case of war, but in vain.

The Dutch proposal met with the same fate as at Brussels.

The German proposal was voted with an amendment of Volders, Belgian delegate, worded as follows :—

> By the side of active propaganda in the army, Socialist representatives in Parliaments must pledge themselves : firstly, to refuse the military budget; secondly, to advocate disarmament untiringly.

Since the Congress of Zurich, the precise question of the attitude of Socialists in case of war has never been aired in the International Congresses.

In 1898, at the Congress of London, the Communist-Anarchists—that is to say, the anti-parlia-

mentarian Socialists who disapprove of electoral political action—were excluded from the Party.

Domela Nieuwenhuis, who, wrongly or rightly, has been labelled an Anarchist, belongs no longer to the Socialist International.

But, with an altogether Dutch perseverance, he has, in 1904, laid down the basis of a new International, the International Anti-Militarist Association, which has taken up as a special task the struggle against militarism and the organisation of insurrection in case of war.

This new International is open to Socialists of all schools; but, in fact, it has been hitherto chiefly composed of Communist-Anarchist groups. Besides, it is as yet, in 1905, in a state of embryo.

It might, however, flourish if the numerous Socialist-revolutionary elements still adhering to the Socialist International, completely turned their energies to revolutionary methods in order to arrest the foundering of its ideals in the sea of reformist and legal paliamentarism.

CHAPTER XXI.

Their Objections:

Our Conception is Anarchistic.

The great public readily confounds the Socialists with the Anarchists. For it an Anarchist is nothing but a Socialist a little redder than the others.

The great public is not so far wrong. The Communist-Anarchists—there is no question here of the pure individualists who readily accept the Anarchistic ticket—are Socialists in the broad sense of the word. They are Socialists or Communists in the sense that they also are for the socialisation of the means of production and exchange.

But what the great public does not know is that Socialists and Anarchists are inimical brethren who have engaged in Homeric battles in which any weapons were good enough for either side. When one fights, in the heat of the struggle and passion, one is not always scrupulous in the choice of weapons: invective, calumny, deadly and venomous accusations, anything is good provided the

adversary is hit. It would be difficult to say who began, who was first in the wrong; an impartial judge would say that on both sides there were grave wrongs. Quarrels among Socialists properly so-called, have not, after all, been less atrocious; the French Revolution had already presented a spectacle of what passion and blind fanaticism are capable of, between inimical brethren.

It is not the end to be attained, it is the means of reaching it which has at all times divided Socialists and Anarchists. Socialists reckon much upon discipline, uniform movements, the action of the masses: Anarchists distrust discipline and the sheep-like spirit of the masses, and reckon more upon individual energies.

Socialists believe in the possibility of the conquest of public powers by the ballot-paper; the Communist-Anarchists consider the ballot-paper dangerous, legal reforms as deceptions, and reckon solely upon the progress of the spirit of revolt to bring about the liberating Revolution.

But Anarchists have at all times proclaimed themselves anti-patriots; Domela Nieuwenhuis is catalogued as an Anarchist. It is not surprising, therefore, that Socialists advocating anti-patriotism and insurrection in case of war have earned for themselves the title of Anarchists.

They have got it. "You are Anarchists!" they call out to us. When anyone wants to kill his dog, he says it has got rabies. In Socialist parliamentary patriot circles, when they want to get rid of an annoying contradictor, they say he is an Anarchist.

But can anyone reasonably consider it a crime for Socialists to extract from the Libertarian* method what good there is in it. It is not an answer to call anti-patriot Socialists Anarchists; the difficulty is not solved, not even shuffled: it is but deferred. What is precisely to be demonstrated is that Anarchists are wrong to call themselves anti-patriots.

Besides, it is not from the anarchistic doctrine that we draw our anti-patriotism; we draw it, as the Anarchists themselves have drawn it, from Karl Marx and from Marxism. We do but repeat what Karl Marx and Engels said, "that the proletarians have no Country." We invoke the class war for a refusal to fight side by side with the classes inimical to our interests.

We invoke proletarian solidarity for a refusal to fight against the German, Italian, or other proletarians.

We contend that we have retained the sane Socialist doctrine, and that it is our comrades the patriot Socialists who seem to have left the good road. They charge us with Anarchist deviation. It is they whom we charge with "bourgeois" and reformist deviation.

Besides, it would not be just to refuse us, the French-speaking anti-patriot Socialists, the title of Socialist. In the Fédération† de l'Yonne, for

---

* The Libertarian is a school of thought current in France which comes between the Anarchist and Socialist schools.

† Federation de l'Yonne: The French Socialist Party is divided into federations of branches, of which there is one for nearly every department in France.

instance, where the immense majority of Socialists are anti-patriots, we have been part of the Jaurèsist fraction of the Party. When several years ago we asked for the expulsion from the Party of M. Millerand, there were, perhaps, Millerandists who taxed us with Anarchism in their innerself; but nobody grudged us the qualification of Socialists.

Besides, that which practically distinguishes the Anarchists from the Socialists is that the latter make use of the ballot-paper: now, the anti-patriot Socialists of the Yonne vote, a few without enthusiasm very likely; but, after all, they vote.

Finally, we all recognise the necessity of conforming to the discipline of the national and international Congresses.

By formulating our opinion on patriotism and the duty of Socialists in case of war, we do but make use of the strict right conferred on us by the fundamental charter of our Party, which says, formally:—

"The liberty of discussion in the Press is wholesome for all questions of doctrine and of method."

Thus it should be understood that anti-patriot Socialists are not Anarchists.

Our patriot Socialist comrades will have to find some other argument.

This equivocation being disposed of, it is our duty to own boldly our heart-felt sympathy for the Communist-Anarchists, whose exclusion from the Party we consider a great mistake, the initial mistake following upon which the Party, relieved of its most undisciplined elements, but who were also the most disinterested and the most revolutionary, slid

every day a little more into law-abiding reformism and parliamentary opportunism.

It pleases us above all, at this moment, when we take up again into the heart of the Socialist Party the thesis of Domela Nieuwenhuis, to show our gratitude to the Anarchist comrades for having kept intact the pure Socialist revolutionary doctrine as far as internationalism is concerned.

CHAPTER XXII.

Their Objections:
"The Countries Will Always Live."

In a recent meeting, when he attempted to refute the doctrines of anti-patriot Socialists before the bourgeois or small bourgeois public which more and more composes his Parisian audiences, Jaurès thought he could sap the conception of the anti-patriots by showing Countries to be everlasting institutions, destined to survive the capitalist régime itself. He said:—

> Fellow-Citizens,—I will first take you to the conclusion of the revolutionary Socialist movement, which is shaping itself at the present hour in all countries where there is an organised working class. We will suppose, fellow-citizens, that communism has everywhere triumphed, we will suppose it to have embraced the whole of humanity, without distinction of peoples, races, or continents; we will suppose that everywhere it has abolished the antagonisms resulting from the social and capitalist organisation of to-day—antagonisms of races and classes. There are no more inequalities, there is no more exploitation of man by man, there is no more a power of concentrated capital, exercising itself upon the whole multitude of oppressed

proletarians, there are no more rivalries, the deadly hatreds of class and class, and of a people towards a people; work alone is sovereign, work alone possesses value by the great human organised collectivity; there are, finally, for the first time since this planet circulated through the clearness of days and the obscurity of nights, no more fragments of humanity hurting one another, breaking themselves one against the other, but a humanity which is one, conscious, organised, fraternal, master of itself, and aspiring to become the master of nature.

Well, in that realised human ideal, in that total humanity constituted and organised, are Countries going to disappear? Ah, they disappear as a force of defiance, of exclusionism, of reciprocal oppression, but they outlive one another in two ways and under two forms. They outlive one another first as an accumulation of original geniuses; the communist humanity of to-morrow would be singularly poor if it were monotonous; but it will inherit by harmonising it with the diversity of national geniuses. Just as individuals with their characteristics, their variety, will not be dissolved in the Socialist organisation, but will there pursue, under more harmonious forms the originality of their nature, so will those historic individualities which are called Countries: English Country, German Country, French Country, Italian Country, Russian Country, to-morrow Chinese Country, when yellow humanity will have emancipated itself from the oppression of the whites—(great applause)- all these Countries with their moral individualities fashioned by history, with their language, their literature, their sense of life, their reminiscences, the particular form of their hopes, with the particular turn of their passions, their soul, their genius, all these individualities will constitute the great communist humanity of to-morrow. It will not be like a monotonous desert where millions of human dried out, arid atoms, float haphazard on the wind; it will be a great unity accidented like the planet but enveloped like it by a unity of luminous space where

the same thought of fraternal humanity will be shining. (Applause.)

Or then, fellow-citizens, if we allow that, in the greatest conflicts, in the great assaults which the decaying capitalist régime may let loose, one of those great national individualities disappeared, that one of those great partial collectivities be extinguished, crushed or bruised, this would not only mean that the humanity of to-day would be impoverished, it would mean also the mutilation in advance of the great communist humanity of to-morrow. Then, in another way, under another form still and for another object, Countries will outlive one another in the communist humanity of to-morrow.

How can you, fellow-citizens, represent to yourselves, how can we represent to ourselves the common life of that great humanity at last constituted and unified? From one end to the other of the planet, all along the circles of longitude or of latitude which encircle it, there are common and universal interests to be managed, a great collective organisation of production, of consumption; but see, fellow-citizens, what colossal and absorbing centralisation you will require for the managing of the common interests of organised humanity, if you suppress all power of autonomous managing of these divers fractions of humanity.

Already to-day, for the managing of the national common interests, you are complaining of the enormous development of bureaucratic centralisation; what would it be for the managing of the common interests of the whole of humanity if there were no organised partial collectivities who could proceed to the management of the common interests of humanity, not by bureaucratic centralisation, but by human federation, by the autonomous action of the various federated nations. You have no choice, or rather you are compelled to choose for the function of the communist life of to-morrow between a colossal and crushing proletarian bureaucracy and the federation of autonomous nations harmonically associated for the common good of humanity.

> And, let me tell those who in the name of libertarian thought have applauded the theories of Hervé that these theories go precisely against what is essential, what is legitimate in libertarian thought.
>
> Already you Libertarians, you Anarchists, fear that collectivism, reduced even to the limits of a nation, even nationally organised, oppress, under minute and tyrannical administrative rules, the initiative of individuals, and you do not seem to see, you who are asking the interior of the nation, in the city, in the Trade Union, in the free associations of individuals, for autonomous groups, federating, harmonising, but substituting that free co-operation to choking administration; you do not seem to understand that the only means for you, individuals, not to disappear to-morrow as in a gulf in the depth of communist humanity, the only means for you to conquer in the universal communism, the universal liberty of initiatives and energies, is to conceive, indeed, the universal communism, not like a bureaucracy, but like a co-operation, and the libertarian elements of that human communist co-operation, are precisely these autonomous Countries which we want to federate. (Loud applause.)

It is easy to gain applause for such truisms. Don Quixote made a great bustle to fight windmills: Jaurès triumphs when he forces an open door.

Who is the Anarchist, who is the anti-patriot Socialist—that is to say, furious enemy of the present Countries—who has ever dreamt of binding the whole of humanity into an immense community governed by a centralised bereaucracy? Who is the Anarchist or the anti-patriot Socialist who is not a federalist—that is to say, who anticipates future humanity, disembarrassed of capitalist exploitation, otherwise but as a federation of autonomous groups? But what need, what neces-

sity is there for the autonomous Socialist groups of the future to be exactly the present Countries, such as the fortunes of war have defined them? Who will stop the oppressed nationalities of to-day from forming autonomous groups or nations, to-day united, from dislocating themselves into several federated groups?

And, above all, what relation is there between such an argument and the question before us, namely, the incompatibility of internationalist Socialism and patriotism more or less nationalist, the incompatibility of the class struggle and the collaboration of classes on a battlefield for the defence of a common Country? What can such a declaration, acceptable for all, have to do especially with the question of the attitude of the Socialists in case of international war?

It is truly playing with words to give the name of Country to the different territorial groups uniting to form a federation.

The proper function of a federation is to abolish the distinct and antagonistic Countries, and to replace them by a common Country.

Can one say, without turning the words from their clearest sense, that in the present Swiss Confederation, composed of 22 autonomous cantons, there are 22 real Countries?

Can one say reasonably that in the United States of America there are as many Countries as States in the Union? Is there really a Country called Louisiana, another Ohio? Is there a Virginian patriotism and a Pennslyvanian patriotism?

In the Canadian Confederation, is each confederated State really a Country?

In the same way, when Socialism has realised on communist bases a United States of Europe there will be no more German Country, nor an English Country, nor a Russian Country; but there will be administrative divisions, territorial circonscriptions which will correspond—or which will not correspond—to the present Countries: there will be but one European Country.

And the day the Socialist federation embraces the American Continent, the Asiatic world, reconciled humanity will form but one vast federation, there will be no longer a European Country, nor an American Country, nor an Asiatic Country, but one Country only—the Earth.

But let us leave there these metaphysical and Byzantine discussions. It is not a question of founding to-morrow the human Country, it is—a more modest task—to prepare the foundation of the European Country, and to ensure that, meanwhile, we put a stop to the system by which, under the pretext of making us defend the present Countries, we French, German, Italian, and Russian Socialists, who already all feel European countrymen, are made to slaughter one another.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Their Objections:
Our Conception is Reactionary.

Just now our conception was an Anarchist conception. Now, it is bourgeois, reactionary, anti-revolutionary. After all, extremes meet!

Here is the objection in all its force, as they expressed it to Domela Nieuwenhuis, as they still express it to-day to us.

If our theory were adopted, "the most Socialistic country would be delivered defenceless into the hands of the most backward country, and the Cossack would reign over Europe."

In France they put the objection thus:—

> Far from being a guarantee for peace, the proposition of the anti-patriot Socialists is an encouragement to warlike nations: a ruffian will rather attack a man whom he knows does not intend to defend himself than one who will offer resistance.
>
> The anti-patriot internationalists aspire to the suppression of Countries—that is to say, to the end

of antagonisms between nations. The system they advocate would lead to the reverse of that ideal.

For example: William II. declares war upon the French Republic. If the anti-patriot Socialists avail themselves of this opportunity for essaying a revolution, they weaken the chances of the Republic and increase those of William.

The latter being victor, what happens? He turns his attention to the revolution started by the anti-patriot Socialists. The latter are then obliged in their turn to defend the Country. But against what odds? With the certainty of being crushed! So that instead of forwarding the advent of the new Country, they will have put it back; they will have strengthened the superannuated form of empires to the detriment of democracies; instead of the Republican Country, they will have restored the Imperial Country; they will have wiped revolutionary France off the map, and will have merged it in militarised Germany. That is nationalism the other way round.

In Germany, the patriot Socialists put forward similar arguments; they try to demonstrate that the adoption of our method would place Germany, the great German Country, under the knout of the Czar.

The patriot internationalists reason as if we ever had said that the anti-patriot propaganda must be restricted to France, and that French Socialists alone must revolt in case of mobilisation. Our firm contention is quite different. We desire and hope to make that conception triumph in the rest of international Socialism, as well with our comrades on the other side of the Rhine as with our Russian comrades.

Undoubtedly, insist the patriot Socialists of France; but the mere intention of propagating your

anti-patriotic doctrines and of provoking insurrection in Germany as in France is not sufficient; propaganda is less free on the other side of the Rhine than with us; it would be paralysed in Germany, so that, in case of war, there would be but France where insurrection would assume any important proportions; thus it would certainly lead to the crushing of the most advanced country by the less advanced country.

In the same way the German Socialists could say: "Germany being freer and more advanced than Russia, your propaganda would have more chance of success in Germany than in Russia; in case of a Russo-German war, it would mean the fatal crushing of Germany."

These objections are but specious.

It is quite true, for instance, that propaganda would be less easily stopped in France by the Government; but, on the other hand, the German Socialist Party numbers three times as many voters as the Socialist Party of France; Germany has an agglomerated industrial proletariat much more numerous than that of France; and from that fact alone, there would already be a sort of compensation. Above all, one may be quite sure that the day the German Social-Democracy shall have resolved to adhere to our anti-patriotic tactic, no Government in Germany will be capable of stopping that propaganda; we need only take as a proof the powerlessness of Bismarck, terrible as his methods were, to stop the progress of German Social-Democracy during the period of twelve years when he tried to subjugate its growing power by

exceptional laws. From 1878 to 1890, they applied to our German comrades draconian laws which Bismarck himself took care should be enforced.

Those laws prohibited every association and every publication having for its aim the subversion of social order, or in which Socialist tendencies appeared. They authorised the police to seize Socialist publications, and to stop every Socialist meeting. They conferred on the Governments of the federated States the right of establishing quite a little state of siege in all working-class towns, and to expel from it every suspected individual.

All political groups of the Party and all Socialist papers disappeared, and about 1,200 or 1,500 comrades were thrown into prison.

But the Socialists reorganised themselves under the form of societies non-political in appearance: trade unions, choral societies, smoking-clubs, etc. The propaganda went on by private conversation or by loose leaflets secretly printed, and the official organ of the Party, which was being printed abroad, continued, at the price of great sacrifices, to spread itself all over Germany.

In 1877, before the iron laws,* comparable to our lois scélérates† against the Anarchists, at the elections to the Reichstag the German Socialists obtained 480,000 votes; in 1890, after twelve years

* Lois de Fer: "The iron laws" against the German Socialists are those above described, and which passed the German Reichstag on October 21st, 1878.

† Lois Scélérates: "The flagitious laws" passed in France in 1894 against the Anarchists in the space of 24 hours, just after Vaillant had thrown a bomb into Parliament.

of persecution, they secured 1,427,000. In face of such results, the Government thought it prudent to abolish the exceptional laws.

Who will be persuaded that a party which was capable, in its infancy, of offering such a resistance to the assault of a Bismarck, would be incapable, now that it is in full adolescence, now that its electoral forces have doubled, of propagating, despite all comers, the doctrine of insurrection in case of war?

The day the German Social-Democracy and the French Social-Democracy desire it, it will not be on one side of the frontier only, but on both sides at once that the Social Revolution will break out.

In the same way, the German Social-Democracy need not fear, in case of war between Germany and Russia, that they will play into the hands of Czarism, by alone proclaiming insurrection, whilst the Russian Socialists march like one man against Germany. Undoubtedly, the Socialist Party is stronger and the Press freer in Germany than in Russia, but if the International decides to answer in all countries a declaration of war by insurrection, there are in Finland, in Poland, in St. Petersburg, and in all working-class centres of Russia, revolutionary elements ardent enough and bold enough to throw the Revolution against the Czarist armies; by the attitude of the reservists in the Manchurian War, one can guess what it would be with revolutionary Germany.

The tactic of insurrection in case of war, be it looked at from the German point of view or the French point of view, does not, therefore, clash

with any material or moral impossibility; and, above all, it does not, as is asserted, carry with it, as a necessary consequence, the enthralment of the more advanced countries by the more backward ones.

If any doctrine is bourgeois and reactionary, it is that of the patriot Socialists. Under the pretext that they will not permit advanced Countries to be exposed to enthralment by retrograde Countries, they sentence the former to refrain from making the Revolution until the day when the latter will have come up with them on the great road of human progress.

Before a revolution may be made in Germany, one must wait—and the day is not far off—until autocracy is destroyed in Russia; and before attempting the revolution in France, one must wait until Germany has become a Republic.

If the French bourgeoisie in 1792 had allowed itself to be hampered by the same considerations, if before making its revolution it had waited for the other peoples to be sufficiently emancipated and enlightened to hinder their sovereigns from throwing themselves upon revolutionary France, we would still be under the old régime.

When we put forward our anti-patriot propaganda they reproach us with exposing the only great country in Europe which has attained the Republican form to the risk of being enslaved by the German monarchy.

But it is precisely because we are politically the most advanced, because we are the freest, because we least risk prison and banishment by exhibiting

our anti-patriotic beliefs that it is for us French Socalists to lead the way.

Our comrade Luquet, one of those Socialists who does not sacrifice the future of Socialism to petty electoral pre-occupations, asks with good reason :—

> Who then ought to have done it; who could have done it before us?
>
> Of what use would be those much-vaunted democratic liberties if they did not allow us to proclaim this new sentiment, this conception, this will of such a high humanitarian importance? It is by making use of its liberties that the French proletariat helps the neighbouring proletariats to win, to enlarge theirs.
>
> Let us set the example. Let us cry aloud that we refuse to be slaughtered, and our virile declarations will re-echo beyond the frontiers. Those who, yonder in Berlin, in Vienna, in Rome, etc., dare not yet proclaim the bold refusal of war, will be involved by us.
>
> And the day is not far off when the neighbouring proletarians will, in their turn, strongly affirm that their sentiments are the same as ours, when they will make use of similar methods, when they will oppose a declaration of war with a strike.
>
> The French proletariat owes to itself and to the world's proletariat the duty of first making that unequivocal declaration.

By proclaiming boldly that in France we will answer an order for mobilisation by insurrection, whoever may be the aggressor, we take away from our German Socialist comrades all pretext to persist in an attitude somewhat equivocal; above all, we take away from them all pretext for marching in case of war; and by the same stroke we suspend over the heads of both Governments, French and German, the only menace that could hold them

back, if they had any inclination to make us fight: the menace of Social Revolution.

If, notwithstanding that menace, the Governments committed the folly of unchaining the dogs of war, they would also, by the same stroke, unchain insurrection, and in that case we would run the risk of a revolution which, if it did triumph, would allow us, in Germany or in France, or perhaps in both countries, to put our hands on the principal capitalist instruments of work in order to exploit them collectively, at the same time creating by the entente between a Socialist Germany and a Socialist France, the nucleus of the United States of Europe.

Undoubtedly, if we attempt the venture the risks for every one of us will be heavy; but would they be less great if we agreed to proceed to an international war? Would not the risks of death be as great in a Franco-German war as in a civil war, class against class?

If our lives and those of our fellows have to be risked, let it be, not for the profit or the honour of our ruling classes, but for the inception of a Socialist régime, under which, by a more intelligent organisation of labour, thanks to the progress of science and machinery, we will secure the well-being, the education, the leisure, and the independence to which all men have a right by their work.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Their Objections:

Our Project of Military Strike and Insurrection is Unrealisable.

When the enemies of Socialism are at the end of their arguments, they say: "Your collectivism is all right; only, it is unrealisable."

Others, more indulgent, add: "It will perhaps be realisable one day; but centuries hence!"

Patriot Socialists use the same argument against the doctrines of the anti-patriot Socialist.

"Undoubtedly, your proposal is theoretically logical," said Adler, at Zurich, to the Dutch comrades, "it marks our intimate convictions, our high aspirations. But in the day of its realisation the Dutch will remain isolated, for their point of view is narrow."

"Yes," said Liebknecht, "if the Dutch proposal were realisable, we would vote for it with both hands. It is but a pious resolution. It is unrealisable. If it were realisable, that would be a

sign that we were at last masters in the economic and political domain, and then there would be no more wars."

What! Have we to wait until Socialism is realised, until the Socialists are "masters in the economic and political domain" before opposing ourselves by force to an international slaughter?

If through the stupidity of a Delcassé, or the fighting humour of a William II., a war broke out to-morrow, the Socialists on both sides of the Rhine would have to march to the frontier, and let themselves be killed for their Country, under the pretext that Socialism is not yet realised!

We are brethren; we have the same ideas, the same class interests, the same ideal, the same enemies: those who exploit us; but we must march just the same; we must be led like lambs to the slaughter if it pleases our rulers to take us there. We cannot help it. A military strike and an insurrection would be very useful; unfortunately, they are unrealisable!

And why unrealisable?

Let patriot Socialists be careful: if the military strike and insurrection are unrealisable in case of war, as long as we are not "masters in the economic and political domain," that is a sign that the Social Revolution itself is unrealisable, and stands condemned.

For what better opportunity could we have for attempting the revolution than when our two ruling classes, French and German, were fighting amongst themselves? What better moment for rising in insurrection than when the country has

been hastily denuded of the major part of the troops which maintain us under the yoke, in order to provide the necessary armies at the frontier?

What more propitious moment for obtaining from the exploited workers a revolutionary effort than when the rulers have asked them to go and risk their lives for interests which are not theirs?

In time of peace every one of them takes care of his own skin; it would not be easy then to involve the masses against the Governmental forces, especially if these were up to full strength.

But with the presence of a state of war the life of everyone is menaced by a foreign ball, and it has less value. One risks it less by exposing it in a merciless struggle against the Governmental forces, especially when these are almost all engaged in facing the forces of the foreign Government with which one is at war.

To declare that the Social Revolution is unrealisable in case of war—that is to say, at the only moment when it has any chance of succeeding—is to say that one is opposed to every social revolution, that one is purely a reformist, that one considers the ballot-paper as the one and only means of realising Socialism.

If that is the idea of the German Social-Democracy, and of the Austrian Social-Democracy, let them say so boldly. At least everybody will then know how he stands. Everybody will know then that whereas Bebel, at the last Amsterdam Congress, bitterly reproached Jaurès for his reformism and his opportunism, he was himself more of a reformist, and still less revolutionary than Jaurès;

he was practically no more and no less revolutionary than the bourgeois Radicals of France.

And if it is the opinion of the whole international Socialist movement that the revolutionary Socialist Party is opposed to all revolutionary means, we must be allowed clearly to understand so, and we must be told straightforwardly and frankly, without any attempt at masquerading, that it is really a reformist advance on "constitutional" lines under guise of great revolutionary phrases.

The military strike and insurrection in case of war are only unrealisable if the Socialist Revolutionary Party, in its different sections, is an opportunist, reformist party, exclusively reliant on advance by legislation.

But if it really is, as it has so often affirmed, reformist always, revolutionary when necessary; if it is disposed, when the opportunity affords itself, to try the chances of a revolution, let it examine anew the proposal of Domela Nieuwenhuis and the Dutch Socialist Party, and it will find that an international war is the best opportunity we have for making our proletarian revolution.

CHAPTER XXV.

Their Objections:

The Electoral Reason.

The patriot Socialists go to a lot of trouble to refute anti-patriotic internationalism.

"Anarchist conception!" says one.

"Bourgeois and reactionary conception!" says the other.

"School boy's idea!" says a third, who explains to us in grandiloquent language that Countries are eternal.

"Unrealisable chimera!" they shout altogether in a chorus.

I pass over insults and coarseness.

Why not speak the truth, patriot Socialists, why not own up where the shoe pinches? Your theoretical discussions and your patriotic indignation do not deceive anybody.

Why not say frankly that you only shout so much because bluntly outspoken internationalist and anti-patriotic declarations hinder your little electoral combinations?

The Socialist Party, in France as in Germany, and even everywhere a little, has let itself slide bit by bit down the slope of parliamentarism. It has become, before all and above all, an electoral party. The essential end for it is to augment the number of Socialist electors, and especially that of Socialists elected.

The propaganda of collectivism or communism and the moral and material organisation of the Revolution only come after, when there is time for them.

Making class-conscious malcontents, that was good enough once, in the heroic times when the pioneers of Socialism went forth expounding bed-rock Socialism to the masses. It is easier and more remunerative to make electors.

For preaching revolt, for sapping those patriotic and other prejudices on which rests the iniquitous and imbecile society under which we suffer, one risks blows, years of prison, misery.

In making electors, one risks nothing worse than to go to the Hôtel de Ville, the Palais-Bourbon, or to some other Reichstag. Perish Socialism rather than lose an election!

And it is not only the candidates who thus bring everything back to the point of view of the electoral battle. The best of militants find themselves caught in the gear; they make it a point of honour to secure the success of their candidate by all means.

You are anti-patriots?

Hush! It must not be said too loudly. Let us say it amongst ourselves, if you like, that the

Countries are ignominious shrews, that one must be stupid, when possessing nothing, not even the right to regular work, to go occasionally to have one's head knocked in for them. Yes! but it must not be shouted from the housetops. The elections are approaching; you are going to make us lose votes and seats.

And the fact is that most Socialist deputies in France at any rate, want to please the Radicals who, at the first or at the second ballot, can turn the scale at their re-election, when they do not constitute the majority of their electors.

But those Radical electors, even when they proudly assume the title of Socialist, which is becoming more and more fashionable now that Socialism is getting a good child, are perfect patriots.

They have received, in France as in Germany also, from their youth up, the patriotic blemish: the patriotic song, the good text-books of history and civic education, at school, have made patriots of them—that is to say, men who are persuaded that their Country is the best, the freest, the greatest of Countries. Military display has acted upon their feelings; they have at the bottom of their hearts, like the Nationalists, a grain of patriotic devotion.

To touch such a deep-rooted prejudice is to give over the whole electorate en masse to the Radical Party!

What does it matter that by sparing that prejudice one leaves flourishing, on both sides of the frontier, a sentiment easy to be worked up at the

slightest international crisis by the influence of the great capitalist newspapers?

What matters it if to-morrow that patriotic sentiment which smoulders in the hearts of the masses blazes out on both sides of the Rhine, and throws two nations at one another's throats for interests which are not theirs?

Is not the real thing the making of Socialist deputies? Nothing else counts by the side of that superior consideration.

The Party has reached such a point of weakness and deformity, it is so poisoned with reformist and parliamentary spirit that he passes for an agitator and a trouble-maker, who places the care of revolutionary propaganda before that of the little electoral profits.

Besides, the violent though concealed anger of Socialist deputies who fear that their chances of re-election will be diminished, must be excused when we think of the precarious situation of those of them who are working men, manual labourers.

Be they paid by the State, as in France, or by the Party, as in Germany, working-man deputies have been uplifted by the suffrage of their comrades, above the common conditions: by their way of living still more than by their higher salary, they have become bourgeois, or at least small bourgeois; and still more than their material conditions, their social standing has profoundly changed. Yesterday, slaves of a factory, here they have all of a sudden become important personages. Cabinet Ministers, prefects, policemen, and concierges treat

them with a respect to which they were not previously accustomed.

Be they defeated at the next election, and they suddenly fall to their former conditions; miraculously raised of the hell of the proletariat, they are once more plunged into it, perhaps for ever.

Their hands, unaccustomed to the tool, their body unaccustomed to the thousand discomforts of the mine or the factory, everything makes them regret the relatively easy life which they have left behind.

Dare they hope to find a master who will employ a former deputy who can wake up to-morrow as an agitator, a leader of strikes!

And there we have the former working-man deputy dethroned, on the search for a situation, tramping the pavement as one of the unemployed, too happy if in France some bourgeois democratic Government is willing to get him a meagre office job.

When a revolutionary compromises the re-election of a poor deputy, especially of a working-man deputy, it is as if he would take the bread out of his mouth, the bread of his wife and children.

Thence comes, for a great part, the implacable opposition, open or dissembled, which anti-patriot Socialism encounters in all parliamentary circles, in France, Germany, and everywhere.

If everything is to be sacrificed to electoral results, let the Socialist Party reject once more the anti-patriotic doctrine of insurrection in case of war.

But if the ballot-paper is, and must be for a long time yet, but a means for obtaining morsels of legislative reform, if above electoral gains the Party places revolutionary propaganda, then, it should not hesitate. At the risk of losing a few seats, which, after all, it will soon have recouped by its bold attitude, let it show itself openly as an anti-patriot party, decided upon opposing itself by force to every international war.

The hesitations of the electorate will, after all, be but passing. The electorate will soon come to understand that by that decided attitude, the Socialist Party, by intimidating Governments, is really the only serious warden of international peace, the only obstacle to the warlike velleities of the rulers, and they will know how to recognise them, even on the day of the poll.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Decisions of the International Congresses of Brussels and of Zurich Do Not Bind Us For Ever.

The Congresses of Brussels (1891) and Zurich (1893) have repudiated anti-patriotic internationalism and the doctrine of insurrection in case of war. And it is well understood that up to now the decisions of those Congresses have had the force of law for the different national fractions of the working-class International.

But though we anti-patriot Socialists do not dream of denying for a moment that the most recent decisions of the Congresses are against our thesis, we must not be held bound for ever by the decisions of Brussels and Zurich. What one Congress has done, another may undo.

Besides, it would be unworthy of a Party of free investigation like ours to stand obstinate, out of a ridiculous self-love, in a once-adopted attitude, under pretext that a great party cannot make mistakes, and can never misjudge itself, and must

never reverse its decisions. An adult party cannot be bound eternally by the resolutions it has passed in its youth.

The timidity of the various fractions of the International on the question of patriotism and Socialist duty in time of war, was quite natural, at any rate very excusable at the time when the Socialist idea was but a frail sapling which the slightest gale might uproot. To-day the tree has deep roots; it is no more in the power of any Government to pull it from the soil. We may dare in 1905 what we did not dare in 1891.

Delayings, finesse, or equivocations are no more acceptable.

In 1891, at the time of the Brussels Congress, France has scarcely emerged from the Boulangist crisis. French Socialists were still a handful: they would have found no echo if they had dared to talk of answering a declaration of war by insurrection.

At the same time, the German Social-Democracy only began breathing, scarcely rid of the exceptional laws. Between Boulangist France, which was threatening Germany with a war of revenge, and Czarist Russia, where autocracy seemed as unshakeable as a rock, the German Socialists had no chance of securing agreement from an important section of public opinion of their country, to the proposal of Domela Nieuwenhuis.

Fourteen years have passed by since the Brussels Congress, during which the situation of all Europe, and particularly of Russia, Germany, and France has sensibly changed.

In Russia, the Manchurian was has recently revealed revolutionary forces hitherto unsuspected; for years to come the Colossus with his feet of clay is shorn of power, and Czarism is in a dying condition.

In Germany, the number of Socialists has doubled; from 1,427,000 in 1890, it has reached 3,000,000 in 1904.

In France, the Socialist Party has become an imposing force, and the Dreyfus affair especially has turned upside down the notions of an important part of the French people regarding the Army and its chiefs. The internationalist spirit, much more even than the Socialist spirit, acted upon one of the most cockaded, most chauvinist, most warlike people that has ever been in Europe.

One of the strongest objections put to Domela Nieuwenhuis at Brussēls, was that of his being a Dutchman.

"The Dutch Socialist Party speaks very easily," they told him, "of insurrection in case of war, living as it does in a small neutral country, sheltered from international complications."

No argument contributed more to lessen the scope of the speeches of Domela Nieuwenhuis. To-day, it is no more the working class of a small neutral country, it is that of one of the great military States which might well sustain before the working-class International the proposal rejected fourteen years ago when it was brought forward by the Dutch Socialist Party.

The results obtained in the course of the last few years by the anti-patriotic propaganda in France, allow us to hope that the French section of the International will at the next International Congress make the proposal of the Dutch section theirs.*

---

* This book was written in 1905; since then the International Socialist Congress has taken place at Stuttgart (August, 1907). Here anti-militarism became one of the foremost questions, and an account of the proceedings will be found in the appendix to this translation.

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Anti-Patriotic Propaganda in the Working-Class Districts of France.

Whilst most French Socialist Parliamentary leaders cannot speak of the Country without a tremolo in their voices and patriotic tears in their eyes, an anti-patriotic campaign is proceeding methodically, which they do not even seem to see.

By the side of the French Communist Anarchists the Socialist Party properly called, whose leaders, Guesde, Vaillant, Allemane, and Jaurès are most heard in France, and which admits the conquest of public powers by the ballot-paper, even beheaded by losing the Anarchists, of its most revolutionary element, has not dropped entirely into reformism and opportunism; the sections grouped behind Vaillant and Guesde, the Blanquists and the Guesdists have for the last four years published annually at the moment of the departure of the class,*a special anti-militarist and internationalist sheet, *Le Conscrit*, which is flatly anti-patriotic.

---

*The Class. See footnote, p. 52.

The last number, that of 1905, for which, it is true, the collaboration of a few Communist Anarchists had been asked, is from one end to the other anti-patriotic. The question of the attitude of Socialists in case of war, is therein treated in the most revolutionary sense. On the first page, a picture represents soldiers turning the rifle butt upside down before a bewildered general, to whom they call out "Vive la grève, général!"* The picture bears for its title "The Proletarians have no Country."

> What is patriotism? says *Le Conscrit*, to the soldiers who are going to leave.
>
> What is that mysterious solidarity which is to unite thee unto death with the man whom chance made to be born on this side of the frontier line, and against him who came into the world perhaps ten yards further?
>
> Is it because you are of the same race? And is the foreigner a barbarian watching for an opportunity to exterminate the adversary race? Well then, tell me of what race thou might be: thy ancestors, dost thou know them? Tell me also why the frontier separates the basques of France from those of Spain, the German Poles from those of Austria and Russia?
>
> Is it the community of language which creates the Country? Well then, tell me which is the Country of the Swiss, the Belgians, or the Germans of Austria?
>
> If it is not the community of race, if it is not the community of language, it must be the community of interests which gathers men?
>
> Perhaps.
>
> But tell me, conscript, what common interest binds the oppressor to the oppressed, binds the master to the

* "Vive la grève, general!": A pun which, whilst meaning "Long live the strike, General!" also sounds as if it meant, "Long live the general strike!"

proletarian? Art thou a miner, a weaver; dost thou till the soil? I can see the interest which binds thee to the miners of Wales, to the weavers of Silesia, to the agricultural workers of the plains of the Po. I can see the common interest for the company or the master who employs thee, and for the company or the master for whom they work. But I cannot succeed in finding out what interest unites thee to thy master, what interest unites them to theirs.

You proletarians, you struggle for the amelioration of your lot, to liberate yourselves from your slavery, to conquer the share of happiness to which you have a right. They as capitalists, seek to maintain you in your chains, to hold back everything that might render you freer and stronger, so as to keep to themselves the produce of the work accomplished by your hands. If they can find foreign workers to perform at a lower price the work you do, they will take them in your stead. And if they find better conditions abroad, they will not hesitate to transplant their works there.

True, patriotism has for its basis interest; but it is class interest. It must start and finish there where the latter starts and finishes. Masters with masters, workers with workers, those are the real nations. On the one side, the yellow international. On the other side the red international.

And what does it matter to thee, to be a Frenchman, a German, or a Turk? Shalt thou work less? Will thou earn more?

Why then, shouldst thou get thyself killed for the Country?

Bethink thyself, comrade. And thou shalt know very soon why they have preached patriotism to thee as a religion. Because one or the other is needed "for the people," and the old one no longer serves. Then they have sung thee that tale. They have launched thee on the "hereditary enemy" so that thou shouldst forget the "class enemy." On the altar where the Madonna no longer drew homage, they have installed the Country, and whilst thou wert stooping, good prole-

tarian, before Her, thy master peacefully hoarded up his money. Didst thou pretend to rebel against thy task? They showed thee "the Uhlan* watching the passage of the Vosges," joyous when they did not send thee to Mexico or China to get the necessary bleeding.

And shouldst thou keep on marching? Conscript, they take thee for a fool! The proletarian has no Country. He has an enemy—the employer; and brothers, his companions of misery. That is what thou must remember.

They will show you the Colours. They will tell you that that piece of silk symbolises the Country, that under its folds there are no more bourgeois nor workers, but Frenchmen only. Conscript, do not be deceived: that flag is not thine. Under the monarchy as under the Republic, thine enimies have lifted it against us. In June, 1848, on December 2nd, under the Commune, its defenders shot your elders.

That flag is their flag. Thy flag is the red flag—that of the Countryless. It is that which, without distinction of stupid nationalities, gathers all proletarians into one mighty host marching towards liberation, and which bears the motto of the International:—

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

By the care of the Socialist revolutionary groups, 40,000 copies of that anti-patriotic sheet were circulated within three months.

At the same time, and side by side with it, the General Confederation of Labour accomplished a propaganda of the same nature.

A Congress of the Bourses du Travail,† held at Algiers, in September, 1902, decided to publish and to spread a pamphlet, the *Manuel du Soldat*,‡

* Uhlan, a German cavalry soldier.

† Bourse du Travail: Labour Exchange. See p. 157.

‡ *Manuel du Soldat*: The Soldier's Handbook.

specially designed to teach the children of the people their duty towards the people during the time they are under the flag.

Here is the conclusion of the *Manuel du Soldat*:—

> Comrades, your reason must forbid you killing other men, your fellow-creatures. Refuse to obey if they want to make murderers of you!
>
> Your workers' conscience forbids you to shoot on other workers.
>
> If they send you into strikes: Don't shoot!
>
> They want to make killing machines of you? . . . . Revolt! And let at last tremble those who dare arm you against your brethren, for your real enemy is he who exploits you, oppresses you, commands you and betrays you.
>
> If they absolutely want you to be murderers with the arms put into your hands, don't be fratricides!

The *Manuel du Soldat* deals especially with the use of the army in strikes.

But Georges Yvetot, the valiant Secretary of the Federation of the Bourses du Travail, who drew it up, and who has borne the responsibility for it before the courts of justice, did not confine his activity to making of that pamphlet a catechism for soldiers officiating at strikes, he dealt fully with the problem of Internationalism and has attacked patriotism itself.

> The Country, says the *Manuel du Soldat*, is everywhere where there are men who struggle, suffer, toil, aspire, and revolt against social injustices. . . . .
>
> Religion or Country is alike. . . . .
>
> Making the sign of the cross or saluting the flag, both denote the same sad condition of mind.

Whilst the Socialist revolutionary groups were spreading *Le Conscrit*, the Bourses du Travail were spreading through the trade unions the *Manuel du Soldat*. Printed a first time to the number of 20,000, it has been necessary to produce eight more editions of it closely following one upon the other. Within two years, 100,000 *Manuels du Soldat* were thus circulated.

The Government and the military casts have, on the other hand, themselves given great impetus to the anti-patriotic propaganda. The brutality and haughtiness of many officers and non-commissioned officers, the attitude of the staff and of the very great majority of the officers in the Dreyfus affair, and especially the immoderate use of troops in strikes, have all singularly facilitated, in the working-class districts, the diffusion of the doctrines of *Le Conscrit* and of the *Manuel du Soldat*.

There are parliamentary Socialists who call loudly for soldiers not to be sent any more to strikes, especially preventively. They are the men who dream of regulating conflicts between employers and employed by compulsory arbitration who perform that peculiar arobatic feat of conciliating the class struggle with social peace.

The proletariat of the French working-class districts fortunately do not seem inclined to submit its conflicts to an arbitration of which the employers would have a thousand oblique means of violating the awards, nor to make good peaceful strikes which would perhaps gain them the goodwill of the

small Radical and Radical-Socialist bourgeoisie, but which would compel them to capitulate unconditionally, when all their coppers were spent.

The only strikes which have any chance of success are those which do not hesitate at having recourse to means of intimidation and direct action.

With that state of public opinion becoming more and more general in the French working-class districts, the bourgeoisie cannot afford to surrender the preventive use of the army, it could not do it, even if it wanted to.

And it is fortunate that it cannot do it.

It is fortunate, despite the working-class victims that the bullets may make, that the ruling bourgeoisie, at the first important strike, exhibits the national army. It is fortunate that by such a concrete demonstration, which stares one in the face, and which is worth more than a hundred speeches and a hundred thousand pamphlets, the mass of the working class realises keenly what a Country is, and to what the army serves.

Nothing less was needed but the tragedies of Fourmies and of Limoges, the brutal cavalry charges and the display of troops of all sorts which gave the towns on strike the aspect of cities in a state of seige, to undeceive that working class hitherto so jingo, so stupidly patriotic.

To-day, thanks to the propaganda of *Le Conscrit*, the *Manuel du Soldat*, and the valuable help the local groups have given them, a salutary reaction has taken place. Four or five years ago, the mass of French workers went every July 14th to see the

military review which was for them, in every garrison town, a grand national fête, and it piously saluted the flags and the standards.

To-day, if the Socialist Party but made the request, thousands of workers would be found in every working-class town, ready to call on the passing of the troops "To Limoges! To Limoges!" to whistle down the tricolour icon, and, in case of war, to refuse to be led to the slaughter.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Anti-Patriotic Propaganda Among the French Rurals: The Work of the "Pioupiou de L'Yonne."

Le Conscrit and the *Manuel du Soldat* have had their effect, especially in the working-class districts; they aimed at the proletariat, and more particularly the proletariat of the towns.

But France is an agricultural country, and a country of small rural proprietors. The peasants form the bulk of the French regiments.

They are known to be keen on their small holdings and very hostile to Socialism; not, of course, the agricultural labourers, but the small land owners.

They are the supreme hope of the party of order, the indestructible dyke which the latter hope to oppose indefinitely to the growing flood of revolutionary Socialism. This is another illustration which they will have to drop.

The results of the campaign of the *Pioupiou de L'Yonne** show that it is not very difficult to make a breach in their indestructible dyke, and that internationalist and anti-patriotic anti-militarism may soon become the uniting link between the peasant masses and the proletariat of the towns.

The department of l'Yonne is almost exclusively agricultural. The largest towns, Sens and Auxerre, though they have a few factories, are, above all, agricultural markets, the most populous centre in the department does not number 20,000 inhabitants.

Journeymen are numerous only in La Puisaye, a wooden region occupying the whole of the southern part of the department and the Othe forest, which stretches its whole length; in the winter they work in the woods, in the summer they do the mowing and the harvesting. Many of them have allotments of land, except in La Puisaye, where large landlords reign.

But the greatest part of the rural population is composed of small landowners and vinegrowers or cultivators, as attached to their small property, as in any other region of France, as refractory as anywhere else to the idea of a collective ownership of the land, in other respects, they are very democratic, and anti-clerical, excellent Radicals.

Like all French Radicals, they were for a long time Nationalists without knowing it; the crisis of

---

* *Pioupiou de l'Yonne*: A newspaper appearing in the department of l'Yonne, where Herve was professor; "pioupiou" is equivalent to our "Tommy Atkins."

the Dreyfus affair was needed to qualify a little their patriotism, to rid it of the gross chauvinism and militarist enthusiasm it contained; however, their patriotism was kept intact by the memories of the three invasions which their department experienced during the nineteenth century, those of 1814, 1815 and 1870-71.

Many communities have their commemorative monument of the last war, which is every year, in several localities, the meeting place of a pious pilgrimage. Every important locality has its section of an old soldiers' friendly society, "Les Vétérans," whose device, "Forget, Never!" sufficiently indicates its patriotic character. At every unveiling of a commemorative monument, at every patriotic pilgrimage, at every banquet of veterans, the local politicians raised the war trumpet to their mouths and talked of revenge whilst they rolled terrible eyes in the direction of the Germans.

Such is the ground on which, in 1900, the Socialists of l'Yonne started sowing anti-militarism and internationalism broadcast.

In April, 1900, the Socialist groups of the department, comprising scarcely 300 or 400 paying members, after they had painfully gathered a few hundred francs, founded *Le Travailleur Socialiste*, the weekly organ of the Federation of Socialist workers of l'Yonne.

Le Travailleur Socialiste instinctively adopted the only line of conduct suitable in a rural country.

To at once preach agrarian collectivism would have meant to risk frightening the small rural land-

owners; *Le Travailleur* confined itself, therefore, during the first few years, to dissipating the peasants' prejudices against collectivism. They were repeatedly told that nobody wanted to take their lands; everything possible was done to make them appreciate the justice of the claims of the industrial workers and the lawfulness of the expropriation of the capitalist class, which in the working-class districts holds the large stores, the mines, the dwelling-holses, etc. It was quickly seen that the rural landowners, as good democrats, were inclined by their natural sympathies, not towards the capitalist bourgeoisie, whom they detest, but towards the working classes, and that they would not lift their little fingers to defend the great capitalist properties as soon as it was well understood that their small holdings would be left to them.

It was only after a considerable lapse of time that the drawbacks of small individual ownership were made clear to them and the various advantages a régime of collective ownerhip in land would offer them, but without attaining on that score any other result for the time being but that of dissipating their prejudices against agrarian Socialism.

But from the first number, *Le Travailleur* had understood that it was by another way that internationalist Socialism would have to be given out to the rural masses; it would have to be introduced to them, not under the aspect "Socialism," but under the figure "anti-militarism and internationalism."

The results were so good that at the end of a year it was decided to open in the columns of *Le Travailleur* a subscription to start a special anti-militarist sheet which would appear twice a year at the time of the *tirage au sort** and at the time of the departure of the class† and which would be sent gratuitously to all conscripts of the department; it was the *Pioupiou de l'Yonne*.

In an unpretentious style, suitable for the agrarian workers, printed in large type, often with pictures that spoke for themselves, *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne* went to take the anti-militarist, internationalist and anti-patriotic propaganda into the remoteness of the smallest villages.

Is there need for the style of *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne*? Here is an article taken from the first number, which appeared in 1901:—

TO THE CONSCRIPTS.

"Little conscript, son of the people, why dost thou go to the barracks?"

"For fear of the gendarmes who would send me to Biribi‡ in case I refused to serve."

"Little conscript, son of the people, why dost thou hate the barracks?"

"Because it is repugnant to me to be rigged up in the costume of a jack-pudding; because I have no taste at

---

* Tirage au sort: Drawing of lots, which takes place in January with the object of designating the regiments which the conscripts will have to join.

† The departure of the class (see footnote, p. 52) takes place in October.

‡ Biribi, a place in Algeria to which refractory conscripts and soldiers are sent for punishment.

all for appearing as a puppet in the streets, and on the public places; because I fear I cannot bear without flinching and without returning the rebuffs of a foul-mouthed officer; because I have something else more useful to do than to serve as a valet, a groom, a coachman, a stableman, a cook, a handyman, or a nurse to my officers and their wives; because I dislike being the goose who goes for three years whilst the sons of the rich, who can afford to polish their trouser seats on the school benches until they are 26, go but for one year; because I know that at our doors, in Switzerland, by an intelligent, economic and democratic organisation, they have succeeded in constructing a solid army of citizen soldiers, asking of all at the most six or eight weeks' military service; because I feel that with such an organisation we would be useless for any offensive war—and I do not hold with offensive war—at the same time remaining formidable if need be, against any unjustified aggression of a neighbouring despot, to defend the Republic and our few small liberties, the only things I am willing to defend unto death. I hate the barracks finally, because if one day it is my misfortune to be under the necessity of using a rifle, I want it to be against my real enemies; for, above all, what I hate is to become a killing-machine, which works to order."

"Little conscript, son of the people, what wilt thou do when thy officers tell thee that thou owest them passive obedience, that thou must execute their order, *all their orders*, without question and without discussion."

"I will *say* nothing; but I shall *think to myself*, or *aloud before the comrades*, that there are circumstances in which I recognise but one chief, one master only—my conscience."

"Little conscript, son of the people, what wilt thou do if thy chiefs one day lead thee with a loaded rifle against workers on strike?"

"I will endure patiently the invectives and the few stones that the hungry strikers may throw at our heads, and I will tell my comrades that in case of a command

to fire, the duty of cowards is to fire in the air, that of men of heart to refuse to shoot on their brethren, the workers in smock frocks."

"Little conscript, son of the people, what wilt thou do if thy chiefs ask for volunteers to go to Madagascar, to Tonkin, to China, or elsewhere to defend 'our interests' and 'the honour' of the flag?"

"I will first try not to burst out laughing in their faces when they come uttering their patriotic tirades; then I will tell the hot-headed and poor-minded ones who might be tempted to enrol themselves that one must be stupid, when miserable and exploited oneself, to go thither to die of fever or dissentery in order to allow a few laced-up grandees to fish in blood for more lace and stars, some huge commercial firm to make millions by the exploitation of natives, a handful of missionaries to introduce at the other end of the world, stultifying and dangerous dogmas. I will tell them that it is the last of callings, that which consists in introducing oneself, armed with quick-firing guns and melinite cannon, to peoples badly armed and incapable of defending themselves, in order to steal their country from them; that all those expeditions, with whatever hypocritical pretext they try to justify them, are but acts of brigandage unworthy of civilised peoples."

"Little conscript, son of the people, what wilt thou do if in a few months the affairs of China bring about a conflict amongst European nations, and there is a question of taking thee to the slaughter to defend our glorious ally, the Czar of all the Russias? what wilt thou do if then, in the town where thou art garrisoned, thou seest thousands of workers, Republican and Socialist, going about the streets shouting: "Down with the war!" What wilt thou do, if they want to lead thee against those people whom they represent to thee as traitors, sold to the Prussians and the English?"

"I will tell my comrades that those men are right not to want to be led to the slaughter for the beautiful eyes of the Czar, or to keep him a large slice of the

Chinese cake; that they are right to refuse to shoot for such interests on the English or German workers, our brethren of toil and misery; and, like the demonstrators, I too will be calling: 'Long live universal peace.' 'Down with war!'"

It will be noticed that, either for fear of frightening the reader, or because it was then his conviction, the author of that article admitted national defence "in case of unjustified aggression on the part of a neighbouring despot."

Here is another article, by the same author. It appeared in *Le Pioupiou*, No. 8, on November 1st, 1904. It marks an advance in the views of the author, an evolution which is that of *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne* and of the Federation de l'Yonne, in the way of anti-patriotism:—

PROPAGANDA WITHIN THE BARRACKS.

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "It's pleasant, eh? to walk about for hours with nothing to do, killing time. And that is our lot every Sunday for three years!"

The Other Pioupiou: "Of course I would be better at home."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "To spend the three best year's of one's life acting the Jackass! Thinking of it alone makes me sick!"

The Other Pioupiou: "Can't help it."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Can't help it! Why?"

The Other Pioupiou: "Why? Why? Well, to defend the Country, eh? to defend our property!"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Got any property, you?"

The Other Pioupiou: "I? No. At home in Brittany, almost all the good lands belong to the lords of the manor or to bourgeois. My father is a farmer; he has not got an inch of land."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Then your father has no property belonging to him to defend?"

The Other Pioupiou: "No."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "And what about you; what's your trade?"

The Other Pioupiou: "I am a farmer's man."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "I see; you have as much property to defend as your father?"

The Other Pioupiou: "Well, yes; nearly."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "And your bedroom-neighbour, the weaver, do you think he has any property to defend? The factory where he works does not belong to him. For a yes, for a no, he can be thrown into the street like a dog. Let his employer install a new machine which can do more work than the old one, and he'll throw him out. 'Look after yourself, my friend, I have no more work for thee!' he will say. And that chap in the bed between ours, the railwayman, has he got any property? Has he got the smallest railway share?"

The Other Pioupiou: He has got, like the weaver, like myself, his salary, enough to oil his human machine in order that it may yield work to those who employ us."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Hullo! you are not so stupid as you look! Suppose to-morrow we became English, or German, or Italian, or that the English, the Germans, or the Italians became French, tell me what would be altered at bottom? The railwaymen, the weavers, the farmer's men, the farmers, all the small ones, all the propertyless would be neither richer nor poorer."

The Other Pioupiou: "And what about yourself; what is your calling?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "I am a market-gardener and vine-grower; I work on my land; I have got enough to keep me busy, but I am no richer for it; I just make ends meet."

The Other Pioupiou: "Then you have something to defend?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Not I; no more than you. Suppose we all became German, English or Italian; well, do you think my land would be taken away? No fear! When the Germans took Alsace and Lorraine, they left to the private people what they possessed; the small property-owners have remained small property-owners, the propertyless have remained beggars as before, and the rich have remained rich as in the past. Nothing has altered, my boy!"

The Other Pioupiou: "Well then, would it suit you to be German or English instead of being French?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "No. I don't care a hang about it! Beggars to-day, beggars to-morrow! Working machines and beasts of burden to-day, working machines and beasts of burden to-morrow! That's kif-kif bourricot,* as Adjutant Delavache says."

The Other Pioupiou: "However, the other day you told me you were a Republican. It would not matter to you then, to be under a king, or under an emperor?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Well, not much, indeed! There is so little difference, outside the label, between the German Empire and the French Republic, at least the bourgeois Republic as we have it to-day. You will tell me that here one has the right of combining; well, there also; that here one has got the right to say what one pleases in the newspapers—that is, the freedom of the press, save being prosecuted when what one writes displeases the government; in Germany there is very nearly the same liberty. Here they hold public meetings; there, too. Here, demonstrations can be held in the street, but the police assault us; there also. Here, when one goes on strike, soldiers are sent to knock about and shoot at strikers; the same thing yonder. Here we have schools, it is true; there, there are quite as many, and education is even more general than with us. In Germany the invalid or aged workers all have old age pensions; they have enjoyed them for nearly

* Kif-kif bourricot: "That's the same thing." An expression brought from Algeria by soldiers, etc.

twenty years. With us, in our Republic, that humane measure is as yet merely a scheme. You see that French Republic or German monarchy is very nearly white cap, cap white."

The Other Pioupiou : " Well then, if we have nothing to defend, neither we nor the German workers or peasants, what are we doing in the barracks?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne : " We serve, the former as well as the latter, as watch-dogs to our masters, those of the rich class, to a million of rich people who possess the railway shares, mining shares, industrial and commercial companies' shares, who possess all the great agricultural estates and the finest forests. If the workers they employ rise up and ask for bread, we are there to give them some lead."

The Other Pioupiou : " There must be rich and poor; there must be capitalists to run the factories, and the railways, to pay salaries."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne : " No; capitalists are not needed. What is needed is capital. But capital is the land, the machines, the factories, the banks. Well, that capital ought to belong, not to a million bourgeois more or less drones, but to the 38 millions of us Frenchmen. The workers and peasant trade unions under the direction of engineers, with improved machinery ought to produce all that is necessary for the feeding, the clothing, the shelter, the work of all. Thanks to working on a large scale, thanks to the improvement of machines, thanks to the obligation imposed upon all to participate in a useful work, a few hours a day will suffice to assure to everyone a comfortable living and a liberal education. All these products, manufactured in great quantities, in the factories, or on the public estates, will be sold to the consumers, without passing through a million unnecessary middlemen, straight from large communal warehouses. Paid with notes on a national bank, the producers will buy in the public shops all they require for their consumption. With a reserve fund, the children of both sexes will be brought up in their families at the expense of the community;

the sick, the infirm, the aged will receive old age pensions providing them with that care and well-being to which they are entitled. In such a way, that wealth which work produces will enter into the pockets of everybody, and no longer into the coffers of a few; the revenues from the land and the factories will form an immense social fund which will be divided amongst the workers. Society will distribute dividends every year to all its members like a limited company to its shareholders. That is what not only sensible factory workers and agricultural labourers ask for, but also landed peasants like myself, the small employers, small shopkeepers who are threatened by the competition of the large agricultural estates, the large factories, and the huge shops, and who have had enough of living in the insecurity of the morrow. It is upon the people who ask for that, that we, the workers in uniform, are asked to shoot if they revolt, tired of being sheared and bled by the capitalists now masters of all means of production. It is for that beautiful job, as watch-dogs of capital, that we the beggars, the exploited, are in barracks. We are here to maintain in misery and servitude the class of workers to which we belong."

The Other Pioupiou: "Then, you would refuse to march and to shoot on the strikers?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Of course; without a shadow of hesitation. I would consider myself an imbecile brute if I shot on workers like myself who work for me and my friends. It is as much as I could expect if I were enough master of myself not to discharge my rifle on the officer who dared to command that assassination."

The Other Pioupiou: "And in case of war with the Germans, what wouldst thou do?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Well, I would desert in order not to let myself be led to the slaughter like a lamb, after the fashion of the Japanese and the Russians who are at this moment cutting one another's throats for the pleasure of their ruling classes. . . . ."

The Other Pioupiou: "It is cowardly to desert!"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "No! What is cowardly is to let oneself be led to the slaughter like a lamb, when one is a man of heart, for the caprice or for the ambition of the class which governs us and exploits us."

The Other Pioupiou: "You may be right."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Or, if we are numerous enough, we will amalgamate, German Socialists and French Socialists, and at the signal of the declaration of war we will group ourselves in arms, and we will march, the German Socialists against the German bourgeoisie, and we against the French bourgeoisie, to instal the Socialist state of well-being and of light for all. Rather than to risk our skins fighting the German workers or peasants who have the same interests as ourselves and who have done us no harm, we will march against the rich class who bleed us."

The Other Pioupiou: "And it is at converting recruits like me to your ideas that you pass your time in the evening after supper, and on Sundays as soon as you are out of the barracks?"

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Quite so."

The Other Pioupiou: "You will end by being sent to Biribi. That's all you are going to gain."

The Pioupiou de l'Yonne: "Well, one has to be careful; one knows to whom one speaks; one does not talk to anybody. And then one must risk something. It is because at all times and in all countries there were people who did not fear either prison or death that it has been possible to propagate new ideas, and to bring our poor humanity some little relief to its misery."

G. H.

Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne would not have gone ahead so quickly if the War Ministry had not done its best to give it a good advertisement. Four times within three years, General André, with a perseverance worthy of a better success, graciously put the room of the Assize Court of Auxerre at the disposal of the journalists of *Le Pioupiou de*

l'Yonne for a public debate with the Public Prosecutor. By a delicate attention, the military authorities, under the pretext of maintaining order among the numerous public who assisted at each of those sensational hearings, sent a picket of soldiers of the Auxerre regiment, who did not lose one word of the speeches, and who brought them back at night to their barrack-room comrades.

Four times *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne* was charged with insulting the army and provoking soldiers to disobedience; four times it was acquitted.

The first time, four jurors out of twelve were found ready to award a verdict of guilty; the second time, but two were found; on the third and the fourth occasions, not one could be found.

Is it necessary to add that at each new prosecution, the circulation of *Le Pioupiou* increased?

Of the first number 5,000 copies only had been printed; the last numbers were printed to the extent of 15,000 and 20,000 copies; altogether, in less than four years, 127,000 copies were printed and almost all circulated in the department of l'Yonne.

Without awaiting these successes for encouragement, the Socialists of l'Yonne created by the side of *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne* a propaganda fund, fed by the voluntary contributions of enthusiasts and the groups, in order to allow speakers to go expounding in the smallest localities the doctrines of *Le Pioupiou*.

That propaganda fund, never exhausted, has allowed of paying the railway fares of a speaker who, every Saturday and every Sunday, and some-

times three and four times during the week, goes out from Paris and visits, one after the other, the localities of the department; of 480 localities he has by now visited 400; in most localities the room is packed; in a few, women are nearly as numerous as men.

What is the result obtained by *Le Pioupiou de l'Yonne*?

Five years ago, the peasants of l'Yonne were ardent patriots, almost nationalists; to-day they are, most of them, quite anti-militarists and internationalists.

Five years ago, the "Veterans,"on every possible occasion, played at soldiers, like big children, exhibited themselves behind their flag, with music at their head, marching in step with a martial gait; to-day many veterans make excuses for remaining in those societies, declaring that they only remain there for the advantages of the friendly society.

Five years ago, politicians at each patriotic ceremony, talked of revanche*; to-day the same politicians, sensible barometers to the change of electoral opinion, do not fear at the annual pilgrimage to the monuments of those who died for the Country, to hold the most pacific internationalist speeches; every patriotic ceremony by and by becomes an anti-patriotic manifestation, or, at least, internationalist, where the "Marseillaise"

---

* La Revanche: The Revenge. An expression which, since the war of 1870-71, has come to stay, and means the moment for which the French Nationalists are still waiting to revenge themselves on the Germans.

is replaced by the songs of "The International" and "War to War."

Five years ago, the recruits of l'Yonne would have been, in the hand of their officers, instruments as docile against the workmen of the towns as the recruits of any other department; to-day, now that their distrust of the working class and Socialism has disappeared, the pioupious of l'Yonne offer as little security to the military authorities as the contingents of the great Socialist working-class districts themselves.

Five years ago, in case of mobilisation, the idea that one might have hesitated to go to the barracks would never have suggested itself to them; to-day, anti-patriotism and the strike of reservists in case of war, is preached openly with the applause of entire audiences, and militant Socialists do not at all hide their declaration that they, themselves at least, would not march, in any case.

That is what a handful of militant Socialists, who all were men of action and no theoricians, have done, not in twenty years, nor in fifty years, but in four years.

In short, they have proved, demonstrated by experiment, that internationalist Socialism can break through the peasant masses, make sure, at least, of their benevolent neutrality in case of strike or revolution, and in case of war of their active co-operation.

And as the peasants of l'Yonne are not made of another clay than those of the rest of France, one may affirm that the day when in each depart-

ment the local Bourse du Travail and the local Socialist Federation signify their willingness to undertake the same methodical and thorough propaganda, the whole of peasant France will be with us when we answer in the towns the next order for mobilisation by the Social Revolution.

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Question Will Be Put.

On April 26th, 1905, in order to celebrate Socialist Unity, at last realised, a great meeting gathered in the immense Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, comprising most of the delegates who had been taking part in the Congress of Unity, together with several thousand militant Socialists belonging to the old sections which had just been amalgamated into a great party of "class struggle and revolution."

There, a speaker who had come to the congress as delegate of the Federation de l'Yonne, made a speech plainly anti-patriotic. The next day, the nationalist Press reproduced his utterances in a conspicuous position, glad to exploit them against the parliamentary leaders of the party.

There are, in Paris, two large dailies which support Socialism; one, *La Petite République*,*

* *La Petite Republique* has now become a bourgeois paper, and Gérault-Richard, who has left it, now edits another bourgeois paper called *Messidor*.

whose editor is Gérault-Richard, Socialist deputy of Guadeloupe; the other one, *l'Humanité*, edited by Jaurès, deputy of the Tarn. Both represent the reformist and parliamentary tendency of the party.

They could not remain silent in face of the venomous commentaries of the Nationalist and Conservative Press, and therefore, both took the defence of patriotism warmly in hand.

Under this title, "The Country in Danger," and the signature of its editor, Gérault-Richard, *La Petite République* published on its front page the following article:—

THE COUNTRY IN DANGER.

At least a fortnight has passed since the detractors of the Socialist Party left it in peace on the subject of war. That could not last. The opportunity having offered itself, they have taken it by its throat, and have sung the same old song: the Socialists are covenanting with the enemy.

The variations on that theme have been provided for them by the oration of a speaker at the closing meeting of the Congress of Unity. This speaker, whose importance as a member of the administrative commission—that is to say of the central organ of the Party—they particularly emphasise, is reported to have blamed the Socialist papers for their patriotism, adding that in his Federation de l'Yonne, the question of the attitude to be observed in case of aggression against France was answered long ago in the negative.

"Without bothering," he is reported to have said, "about getting to know who is the aggressor, we would answer a call to arms by the general strike of reservists."

I was not at the meeting; I am, consequently, ignorant whether those words were uttered. But, at first sight, I would wager my hand that the sense and

the text have been travestied, for they flatly contradict both the Socialist sentiment as well as its doctrine.

Socialism being the revolt against the enslavement of men by other men, and proposing itself to put an end to the violences that certain individuals exercise upon other individuals, certain collectivities upon other collectivities, a Socialist will never allow a man to ill-use his fellowmen, nor an empire to attack, arms in hand, a Republic with the object of lucre and domination. If that Republic is his own Mother Country, the Socialist certainly will not see the advantage of abandoning it defenceless to the mercy of the aggressor, any more than he would refuse his help to a violated woman, under the pretext that that woman was his mother.

So much for the Socialist sentiment which is, after all, a human sentiment.

The doctrine of our Party confirms that idea. In France we have always endeavoured to dissipate the confusion purposely established by our detractors between internationalism and anti-patriotism. All Socialists profess identical principles on that point, as is shown by the declarations of all those who are authorities, from Jaurès to Guesde and Vaillant.

The Socialists of l'Yonne do not except themselves from that rule. Witness our old friend Camelinat, who at the last general election was attacked for being in the past a communard, and who answered that the Commune had been at the same time a rising of Republican and Socialist Paris against the monarchical doings of the Assembly of misfortune, a protest of Parisian patriotism against the capitulators.

Bebel recently delivered a speech in the Reichstag in which he refuted that accusation of anti-patriotism which seems the international argument of the defenders of the capitalist régime. He said: "At the slightest danger, we would be the first to take the rifle upon our shoulder for this German Country: she belongs more to us than to you. . . . ."

Nobody has forgotten the admirable protest of Jaurès in the Chamber of Deputies concerning our pretended adhesion to the violation of the right of men upon the people of Alsace-Lorraine.

Finally, if the speaker at the meeting of Unity had really used the words attributed to him by the Nationalist press, he would have but obeyed a very strong predisposition to pacifism, unless, perhaps, it was coarse puffing or disgusting stagery. He would thus have worked to the destruction of his ideal, for the most certain way to call upon oneself an aggression is to announce one's incapacity to defend or one's complete resignation to defeat.

The member of the Administrative Commission of the Socialist Party who is reported to have made the speech which reaction is exploiting with such delight in all its papers would thus have belied in one stroke logic, Socialist doctrine and humanitarian sentiment. For this reason we can see nothing more than another forged invention on the part of our unscrupulous opponents.

GÉRAULT-RICHARD.

Viviani, a former deputy* of Paris, returned to the subject in the columns of *l'Humanité* of May 4th in the following article:—

THE IDEA OF THE COUNTRY.

Socialist Unity would mean inertness of thought, and our party would become a mere congregation if we had not the right, as concerns the members of our party, to defend our own opinions. That is why, whatever our enemies may think, we feel no compunction in repudiating without reserve the theories which were attributed by the Press to a Socialist, and which he has just been confirming, if we can believe the newspaper

* René Viviani, now a Cabinet Minister at the head of the newly-formed Ministry of Labour.

La Liberté. Besides, we have no merit in making this repudiation heard, for the whole Socialist Party is hostile to the idea expressed at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, and which is said to uphold that " whoever might be the aggressor, we would, in case of war, answer an appeal to arms by the general strike of reservists." The speaker has spoken as it pleased him; he involves but himself and no one else. Our entire Party has too often been called upon, under the fire of calumnies, to distinguish between internationalism and anti-patriotism, or saddled with those theories which draw from their paradoxical nature, more than from their pretended novelty, an importance underlined by all the enemies of Socialism with a cheerfulness which might perhaps enlighten the speaker who uttered those words.

For, one may imagine that if the Nationalist press emphasises that speech, it is not because it believes in its import. It knows very well that, except the one who pronounced it, nobody in our Party approves of it. Only, it seizes the opportunity of identifying our entire Party with one man, and of incorporating that detestable paradox into our doctrine. A hundred times our Party has declared to the contrary. A hundred times has it said it was ready in case of a war, and without considering who was the aggressor, to defend the national soil, and with it the rights of the freest and the sweetest Country there is under the sun, the patrimony of the Revolution, that immortal legacy of human civilisation which has cost our fathers too many tears and too much blood for ungrateful sons to allow it to be dispersed under the blows of force.

That is what we have always said for France. That is what the Socialists of other countries have always proclaimed as far as they are concerned, and amongst them, Bebel, not very long ago. If there were on the other side a vestige of good faith, they would recognise on that point the permanence of our doctrines, instead of seeking to find an indication in the excesses of an isolated speaker who is master of his own thoughts, but not of those of others. But why reckon upon good

faith and equity? Few Nationalist writers could hold a pen if they had to dispense with mutilation every day.

Such doctrines are not only false, they are fatal to our Party. And if it allows itself to be led by them, or if it does not firmly disavow them, it will be seeking vainly one day in isolation all traces of its influence and of its authority. It is so much more fatal because Nationalism, howling and mischief-making, quick at equivocations and lies, is ready to feed on these paradoxes from which for a few days it will draw a miserable life. If one wanted to arm Nationalism, to justify it, to write in advance its manifestoes, to côlour its speeches in advance, one could not act better. And so much the better that our internationalism ignored, misunderstood, or travestied, lend the fool and the perfidious opportunity for the falsest interpretations. We are internationalists; we want peace amongst peoples, the repudiation of that legacy of bloody barbary belated in a humanity which boasts of its progress. We want the union of the workers, and, the exploitation of man being universal, let universal resistance correspond to it. And we reckon, with time especially, more upon those fraternal unions to avoid war, than upon general strikes in front of the enemy's bayonets. If a few laugh at us, we can already answer them by results at hand. Does anyone believe that all the diplomatic incidents that have ever happened could secure that happy end if for so many years a new life of fraternity and goodness had not been circulating in Europe under the ardent support of the proletariat? That is what our Party wants, what it has always wanted. It has never said or wanted anything else. Its general idea is to be found in its manifestoes, its speeches, its collective work, and not in the harangue of a speaker whom it has not entrusted with any mandate. France, certainly, belongs to all, but she belongs as much and more to the proletariat, which has, by its uninterrupted labour, made her material splendour; which has fought for her all alone in times of military replacement, when the patriot bourgeoisie proceeded to "the deal of the whites," which to-morrow

will be gloriously entrusted with the Country, and which will know well how to preserve her. And its noble task would be to protect to-morrow with its armed hands, this Country where its life is so miserable, but which remains for it the instrument of reparations, of reforms, of revolutions, and like the superhuman lever with which Danton wanted to uplift the world.

RÉNÉ VIVIANI.

The speaker of the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall whose personality and ideas were thus discussed immediately answered in *Le Travailleur Socialiste*, the official organ of the Federation Socialiste de l'Yonne, with the following article:—

TO THE PATRIOT INTERNATIONALISTS.

For once I speak at Paris before a numerous audience, and I have no luck.

Not only does the Nationalist press condemn sharply my impious utterances, but the great Socialist press, so-called, abuses me harshly.

Gérault-Richard, from the top of his stool, in *La Petite République*, charges me, subject to an oratorical reservation, with coarse puffing and disgusting stagery, over which N. Merlou's journal rejoices greatly.

Viviani, more delicately, lets me know in *l'Humanité*, Jaurès's paper, that my opinion on the Country is but an exceptional opinion, almost monstrous, and that the Party has at all times professed on that matter a diametrically opposite opinion.

Why all this great wrath?

Because at the meeting in the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall, which closed the Congress of Socialist Unity, I said what I have been repeating for three years in the smallest localities of l'Yonne, to the cheers not only of all our militants, but of the simplest of simple peasant democrat republicans. I have said that in case of war with Germany—as in case of conflict one never knows

at the moment who is really the aggressor—we in l'Yonne would answer the order for mobilisation by the general strike of reservists at first, and by insurrection afterwards; that we were firmly decided not to give a drop of blood, a square centimeter of skin, for the existing Countries; and that we entered Unity with the idea of propagating this conception of internationalism in the whole of the Party, and particularly with the German Socialists who hitherto have shown excessive timidity as far as internationalism is concerned.

Gérault-Richard, Viviani, and a good many of the Parliamentarians of our unified Party repudiate indignantly this conception of internationalism.

It is their right. Viviani is right: Socialist Unity would be indeed led to inertness of thought, and our Party become a mere congregation if we had no right as members of our Party to defend our own opinions.

It is also to their interest as Parliamentarians that the voters shall not be frightened by subversive declarations.

There is even, perhaps, due from them a sense of gratitude towards a Country, which seems to Viviani "the freest, the sweetest Country under the sun."

There are, at the head of the old reformist fraction of the Party, a few comrades who may find her free and sweet, they who (by their work and their talent, I do not deny) gain incomes of 25,000 to 30,000 francs a year —that is to say, incomes of millionaire capitalists; neither do I reproach them for it, nor do I envy it them, having very few personal needs; but I am obliged to state it in order to explain to myself with what filial piety, with what tender gratefulness, they talk of the Country: let them, then, defend it unto death.

But they are strangely mistaken if they imagine that the working proletariat, overworked and mutilated, who form the bulk of the Party, the miserable proletariat for whom the French Country remains, under Republican label a stepmother as hard as the German Empire itself, are disposed to give their lives for her.

Viviani, like Gérault-Richard, affirms that the whole Socialist Party repudiates my conception of internationalism.

And the Socialists of l'Yonne, in the name of whom I have propagated it for the last three years, in the smallest localities of l'Yonne, do they not belong to the Socialist Party?

And the Socialists of le Loiret, la Nierve, le Rhone, la Loire, la Somme, Muerthe-et-Moselle, who have cheered my most brutal anti-patriotic declarations with thunders of applause, do they not belong to the Socialist Party either?

Ah! the entire Socialist Party repudiates anti-patriotism!

We shall see that at the next Congress of the unified Party, we shall see next January if the Socialist Party, French section of the working-class International, is patriot or anti-patriot.

I warn candidates who during the elections like to run with the patriotic hare and hunt with the internationalist hounds, that the question will be put: will it not, Countryless of l'Yonne?

GUSTAVE HERVÉ.

The latter were not long in making their sentiments known. If one will believe the following declaration, which appeared in the official organ of the Socialist workers of l'Yonne, that sentiment is exactly that of the speaker of the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall:—

The delegates of the two Federations de l'Yonne gathered at Laroche, on May 14th, in view of the unification of the Socialist forces of the department,

Congratulate comrade Hervé on having given voice at the Tivoli-Vaux-Hall to the anti-patriotic ideas which are the exact expression of the sentiments of the Socialist Party of l'Yonne.

Strongly condemn citizen Gérault-Richard for having, under pretext of Hervé's utterances, addressed to him in *La Petite République* insults which necessarily touch all Socialists who think like Hervé.

Regret that citizen Viviani has arrogated to himself the right to present his personal opinion as being that of the entire Socialist Party.

And, considering that the national or governmental label of the capitalists who subjugate them, does not matter to the proletarians,

That the class interest of the workers is, without any possible derivation, the struggle against international capitalism,

Repudiate bourgeois and governmental patriotism which falsely affirms the existence of a community of interests amongst all inhabitants of one and the same country.

And, in view of the diplomatic situation which from several points threatens to disturb European peace, invite all militants to answer any declaration of war, from whichever side it may come, with the strike of reservists and insurrection.

Benard,	Bouile,	Clemendot.
Duporc,	Flogny,	Rolland,
Foltz Jalmain,	Millerat,	Millet.

If the Socialist Party puts before everything the electoral and parliamentary conquest of public powers; if, in spite of its revolutionary affirmation, it is but a party of reform, a party of slow and peaceful evolution; if it only declares itself a party of revolution for the vain glory of decorating itself with a revolutionary plume, like our ancestors who, in order to look more terrible, put on their head hides of ferocious animals, it will have to say that it is patriotic.

But if, on the contrary, the Socialist Party is really a party of revolution which does not sacrifice the ideal of the future to mean electoral preoccupations of the moment, then it will answer straight that it is anti-patriotic.

Pending it being put before the whole International Congress, the next congress of the Socialist Party, French Section of the Working-class International, is going to be laid under the necessity of pronouncing upon this grave question of principle and method.

At any rate, the question will be put.

We shall know then what the Socialist Party, which proclaims itself a party of class struggle and of revolution, thinks of the Country and of the attitude to be taken in case of international war; we shall get to know what it has got in its belly—whether it has got anything in its belly.

If, contrary to all hopes, it has nothing in its belly, the anti-patriot Socialists will not deem themselves beaten.

The Socialist Party is not the only proletarian organisation; by the side of it, powerful trade unionist organisations exist in all countries. In France, the whole of those organisations bear the name of "General Confederation of Labour."

Whilst the Socialist Party groups the revolutionary Socialists without distinction of profession, the General Confederation of Labour groups the workers by trade.

Each working-class district is the seat of a Bourse du Travail, which groups the different trade unions of a locality or district, and all the

Bourses du Travail together form the Federation des Bourses.

On the other hand, from one end of France to the other, the trade unions of a similar trade corporation are gathered into national federations of trades, and the different federations of trades are united amongst themselves.

District Bourses du Travail and national federations of trades together form the General Confederation of Labour which holds an annual congress.

If the Socialist Party hesitates, for electoral reasons, to solve, in a revolutionary sense, the question of the attitude of Socialists in case of war, the General Confederation of Labour, which does not boast of moderatism nor of Parliamentarism, will, without doubt, be able to adopt the virile resolutions which the anti-patriot Socialists have already taken.

APPENDIX.

Anti-militarism at the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart, 1907.

Since the Congresses of Brussels (1891) and Zurich (1893) the world-wide Socialist Party has, in almost every country, made enormous srtides in the direction of anti-militarism.

In France, nothing has contributed more towards weakening the prejudices of a large number of Frenchmen regarding the Army and its leaders, and towards purging them of the gross Chauvinism and militarist enthusiasm of which their patriotism was made than the Dreyfus affair. The spirit of internationalism, still more than that of Socialism, is pervading the minds of one of the most militarist and most bellicose of peoples.

In Germany, where the spreading of any subversive doctrine is made very difficult, anti-militarist propaganda is proceeding as covertly as did Socialist propaganda during the eighties under

Bismarck's iron laws,* and one may expect soon to be startled by the attitude towards war of our Socialist brethren there, as the world was startled in 1890 by the one and a-half million Socialist votes polled after twelve years of persecution.

Karl Liebknecht's book, *Militarismus und Anti-militarismus*, for the publication of which he has had to undergo a term of imprisonment, is far from Hervé's in spirit and ideals, being merely an exposure of the various forms which anti-militarism is taking in the different countries; but it is a sign of the times, and more may be expected from Germany at an early date.

In Italy, *Leur Patrie* has been translated and published by the Genoa newspaper *La Pace*, and a group of Revolutionaries at Turin have recently started a newspaper, *La Guerra Sociale*, on the same lines as Hervé's *La Guerre Sociale*; but the Government is already prosecuting them, thus giving Italian anti-militarism a good and welcome advertisement.

As pointed out in Chapter XXVI. of this book, and in fulfilment of Hervé's anticipation, the proposal rejected fourteen years ago at Brussels and Zurich was this time introduced, not by the representatives of a small and neutral country like Holland, but by those of a great military State. In fact, the anti-militarist question was the great attraction of the Stuttgart Congress, and the one upon which all minds were fixed. The lengthy resolution, arrived at by compromise, is another

* Iron laws. See footnote, p. 191.

KARL LIEBKNECHT.

sign of the times, and shows the irresistible flow of opinion towards Hervé's clear and unmistakable doctrine. Here is an account of the proceedings:—

The "First Commission" to which this question was referred was extraordinarily well attended. All the great nations had made full use of their right of representation by sending members to the Commission, and the smaller nations were also represented, the delegates being:—

France.—Hervé, Vaillant, Jaurès, and Guesde.

Great Britain.—Andreas Scheu, James Gribble, Russel Smart and Gossip.

Germany.—Bebel, Vollmar, Sachse, and Südekum.

Italy.—Weiss, Costa, Ferri.

Austria.—Eldersch, Winarsky, Schramel, and Adler.

Poland.—Karski and Rosa Luxembourg.

Belgium.—Vandervelde, Furnémont, Troclet, and De Man.

Holland.—Schaper and Henrietta Roland-Holst.

Switzerland.—Lang, Moor, and Sigg, besides numerous delegates to the Congress of all nationalities who had come to listen to the debate, amongst them Karl Liebknecht.

Südekum occupied the chair, and there were four resolutions on the paper: one from Hervé, one

from Bebel, one from Vaillant, and one from Guesde, worded as follows:—

HERVÉ RESOLUTION.

Considering,

That it does not matter to proletarians under what national and governmental ticket the capitalists exploit them;

That the interest of the working class is exclusively the struggle against international capitalism;

The Congress,

Rejects bourgeois and governmental patriotism which upholds the lying affirmation of the existence of a community of interests amongst all inhabitants of the same Country. It declares that it is the duty of Socialists in all Countries to fight only for such objects as will bring about the collectivist or communistic régime, and defend it once they have built it up, and

Calls upon all comrades, in view of the diplomatic incidents which, coming from all quarters, threaten European peace, to answer any declaration of war, from whatever side it may come, by military strike and insurrection.

BEBEL RESOLUTION.

Wars between States in which the present capitalistic order subsists are generally the consequence of the rivalry of the different nations in the markets of the world, as every nation endeavours not only to retain for itself the use of its own markets, but also to acquire new ones. The subjection of foreign peoples and the confiscation of their land are the principal means employed for the attainment of that result.

Wars are favoured by the prejudice of each people against all others, which is systematically cultivated among civilised people in the interests of the dominating classes.

Wars are consequently the result of the very nature of capitalism, and they will only cease when capitalism is abolished, or when the enormous sacrifices in men

and money exacted by the development of military science, and the revolt provoked thereby shall have driven the civilised nations to suppress the system.

The working class, which furnishes the combatants for the wars and bears the material burdens caused by them, is essentially the natural enemy of war.

Wars are in direct opposition to the aim of the working class, namely, the creation of a new economic order, based on Socialist principles, which will make the solidarity of all nations a reality.

The Congress, therefore, considers it the duty of all working men, and particularly of the representatives of the working class in Parliament, to fight all increase of armaments, either on land or sea, by refusing to governments the means wherewith to carry out these policies, by pointing out the class character of bourgeois society, and the causes which lead the capitalistic class to cultivate national antagonisms.

The Congress considers the democratic organisation of the military powers of the nation, which should include all men capable of bearing arms, an important means of preventing the attacks of one nation upon another, and of facilitating the disappearance of national antagonism.

When war appears to be imminent, the working class of the countries immediately concerned, and their representatives in Parliament, are in duty bound to do all that lies in their power, using all such means as they may deem most efficacious for the purpose, to prevent the outbreak of war, and, should war break out notwithstanding all their endeavours to prevent it, they should make all possible efforts to secure its speedy termination.*

VAILLANT RESOLUTION.

I.—The Congress again confirms the resolutions of former International Congresses.

(*a*) For action against militarism and imperialism, which are but organised armament of the

* The above text is as supplied by the International Bureau.

State for the maintenance of the working classes under the economic and political yoke of the capitalist class.

(*b*) To remind the working class of every Country that no government can threaten the independence of a foreign nation without outraging that nation's working class as well as the International working class; that it is the imperative duty of that threatened nation and its working class to protect their independence and autonomy against such attempt, and that they are entitled to rely on the help of the working class of every other Country; that the anti-militarist and solely defensive policy of the Socialist Party, calls upon it to pursue with this view the military disarmament of the bourgeois class and the arming of the working class by the general armament of the people.

II.—The Congress, confirming the decisions of the preceding International Congresses and of the International Bureau, considers the international solidarity of the proletariat and of the Socialists of every nation as their first duty;

Reminds them that every year, on the First of May, they should demonstrate for this solidarity and for its first necessary consequence, the maintenance of International Peace.

And invites them at the moment when, in presence of the growing Russian Revolution, with Czarism at bay, and of the neighbouring imperialism which seeks to aid it; when, faced with incessant capitalist enterprises and piracies, the International Bureau and the Interparliamentary Conference have been obliged, with the consent of the Socialist Parties of every Country, to take the necessary steps to assemble their delegates, and give them the means, in case of an imminent international conflict, to decide on the measures to be taken in order to forestall and prevent it;

Invites them to render the effect of these decisions possible by means of a plan prepared, ordered, and co-

ordinated by the national and International Labour Socialist organisation which shall put forward in every country, and especially in the Countries concerned and according to the circumstances of the moment, the whole energy and the whole effort of the working class and of the Socialist Party for the forestalling and prevention of war by every means, beginning with parliamentary intervention, public agitation, popular manifestation, and proceeding, if necessary, even to a general Labour strike and insurrection.

GUESDE RESOLUTION.

Considering,

That militarism is, as all International Congresses have declared, the natural and unavoidable result of the capitalist régime, based on the class struggle, and that this militarism cannot be abolished without abolishing its source, the capitalist régime;

That by the concentration of all working-class activities on the question of militarism they are drawn away from the real aim of their task: the conquest of political power for the annihilation of capitalism and the socialisation of the means of production;

That, on the other hand, the doctrine of this anti-militarism (from desertion and military strike to revolt) are only calculated to render propaganda and recruiting for Socialism more difficult, and thus to postpone the moment when the proletariat will be sufficiently organised and strong enough to put, by the Social Revolution, an end to militarism and all wars;

The Congress declares:

That the only campaign against militarism and for peace, if it is not to be a Utopia or a peril, must consist in the Socialist organisation of the workers of the whole world for the overthrow of capitalism, and that in the meantime all international wars be made impossible by reducing the terms of military service, by refusing all

money votes for army, navy, and colonies, and by propaganda for the general armament of the people, and

That it is the duty of the International Bureau, in case a political conflict threatens, to meet according to its rules and take the necessary measures.

Vandervelde proposed to start immediately with the special debate on the four resolutions before them; Hervé, who advocated military strike and insurrection against war, and Guesde, who rejected all special agitation against militarism, and only considered it as a phase of the capitalistic system, were the extremes. If their resolutions were considered first and dropped, an agreement on the more averaging line of Vaillant and Bebel would be easy.

Bebel opposed the proposal on the ground that it would lead to four great general discussions.

The Commission then decided unanimously to enter upon a general debate, which was opened by Bebel, who spoke as follows:—

BEBEL: I thought we had discussed these questions quite sufficiently in our International Congresses. All that Hervé puts forward in his book "Leur Patrie," we have been told by Domela Nieuwenhuis at our previous International Congresses. Hervé thinks the Country is but the Country of the ruling classes, and hence does not concern the proletarian. But is not also Parliament an institution of the ruling classes? All our endeavours are directed to reforming the economic, political and social institutions of the bourgeoisie. Besides, it is a great question whom the Country belongs to. The whole culture of a people evolves only on the basis of the mother tongue, on the soil of the nation. Look at Austria, where the

Poles struggle for the reintegration of their nationality. In Russia also will the question of nationality awake again.

Rosa Luxembourg contradicts.

Bebel: Each people that suffers under an alien domination, even though it thus receives certain benefit, rises with all its might to the struggle for freedom, and puts aside all other aims. How did Alsace-Lorraine struggle against its separation from France, with whom, in spite of the German language, it had been, since the great Revolution, so closely akin in sentiment and progress? Hervé's idea that it makes no difference to the proletariat whether Germany conquered France or France conquered Germany is absurd. It is so ungrateful, too! If you, Hervé, were to try that theory practically, your own countrymen would tread you under their feet. Liebknecht and I experienced in 1870 what it means when one merely abstains from voting on war matters. And yet we already knew that Bismarck had provoked the war and the proof of the falsification of the Ems dispatch has proved it to the whole world. Besides, it will always be easy to a learned politician to make the difference between a war of aggression and a war of defence.

But let us also try the question of anti-militarism practically. As a reasonable man I must tell you openly that even if we wanted to, we could not perform what Hervé asks from us. And I am afraid that you in France will also experience bad times when, in case of war, you try the Hervéan method of general strike, desertion of the flag and insurrection. In Germany they have even prepared an accusation of high treason against Karl Liebknecht, who is far off from Hervé. If we were really to abandon the strict neutrality towards the army which we are now compelled to impose upon ourselves, we would immediately get all the paragraphs of the penal code upon our necks. But the anti-militarist agitation in France would, if it had any success, endanger the world's peace, for the German

military circles follow them with the greatest interest, and a disorganised army would magnetically draw a strong adversary. Neither is there anybody who in Germany earnestly wants a war. The rulers know very well that they cannot rely in *all* circumstances upon the two million Socialist reservists. Even Prince Buelow has admitted that a war of the ruling classes now might be their last war. We are absolutely at one in the idea. We have fought militarism most decidedly in the German Reichstag; we have refused it every penny, so that Jaurès has already been held up to us as a model of patriotism.

JAURES: Just like you to me in France.

BEBEL: Yes, because in my explanation instead of "*defensive wars*" they put simply "wars." Also during the Morocco affair we have done all we could to avoid the terrible split of the two civilised nations. As far as a military force is still necessary, we also want it, but in the form of the most complete, the freest democracy. We fight war and militarism in this way at every point and every day, but we cannot, and we will not, let ourselves be drawn into a method which may become highly dangerous to the whole vitality, the very existence of the Party. (Great applause from the German benches.)

GUSTAVE HERVÉ: I do not know whether the General-Staff in Berlin follow with as much sympathy as Bebel declares, the propaganda which my friends and I are carrying on in France; what I know well is that Socialist and Revolutionary France which attentively follows the debates of this Congress, will learn with a sadness mingled with stupor of the pitiable reasons upon which you base the blunt rejection of our proposals relating to an international action of the proletariat against war.

JULES GUESDE: That is a mistake; they will not feel any sadness for it in France.

HERVÉ: Yes, Guesde; we all know that you are doing in France the sad business which Bebel has just

been doing on this platform; but in France it is of no importance; we are there to watch you and to keep you out of mischief-making. We have beaten you at Limoges* and at Nancy.† We will take care of you when we get back to France, but here in Germany the nefarious tendencies of Bebel unfortunately have no check.

Let me—without interrupting me as you did at Nancy, you and your friends—explain to our German friends the origin of our campaign.

When two years ago the rumour went abroad of an entry of the German Army into Poland, in order to checkmate the Russian Revolution, we found out that the German comrades would confine themselves to opposing the "moral force" of their three million voters.

When, at about the same time, the Moroccan conflict very nearly unchained a Franco-German war, we found out again that our German brethren had nothing to oppose to an order for mobilisation but the "moral force" of their electoral organisations.

We considered that that was not sufficient.

In order to intimidate our government, and at the same time remind our German comrades of their duties as Internationalist Socialists, we have shouted our war cry against the bourgeois Countries. We have shouted it at the tops of our voices, using purposely strong language in order to force the attention of the indifferent and apathetic crowd.

Our propaganda in France has had a formidable success. The 41 anti-patriotic votes which supported the Yonne motion,‡ that is something; the vote by the Congress of the General Confederation of Labour at Amiens of an anti-patriotic motion is a yet more striking

* Limoges, where the *French National* Socialist Congress took place in 1906.

† Nancy, a place in France on the German frontier, where the *French National* Socialist Congress had just taken place (August, 1907).

‡ At the Congress of Nancy.

illustration. If, moreover, you will consider that the Vaillant motion only got an appreciable majority but by our 41 odd votes, that fact should be a great recommendation for our conception; finally, if you will recall the state of military decomposition revealed by the events of the South*—partly due, only partly, to our propaganda—you will be convinced, as we are, that we have morally disarmed the French Government. It knows that a declaration of war would be the signal for partial insurrections at least in the great working class districts, that it would mean for it a leap into the revolutionary unknown.

If we have started that propaganda on the other side of the frontier, alone, without your coming along with us, it was because we trusted you, German comrades.

We thought we could give you a large credit. We gave you credit, first because we thought it was for that people who could carry on such a propaganda with the least danger for its militants, to set the example. We find ourselves, we Socialists of Europe, faced by an inimical line formed by the whole capitalist class; the weak point of the inimical line is in France. Our rulers know that there have been in France victorious popular revolutions and they know that we are still capable of making another. You, Bebel, told Jaurès at Amsterdam, when you applied to him the whip of German Social-Democracy, that it was the Prussian Army which at Sedan had given us our Republic. That is true, and I would be grateful to the Prussian Army if it had done it purposely. But it was not the Prussian Army which took the Bastille, on July 14th, 1789; it was not the Prussian Army of Brunswick which took the Tuileries, on August 10th, 1792; it was not the German Army which drove out the Bourbons, in July, 1830, Louis-Philippe, in February, 1848; it was not the Prussian Army which made March 18th, 1871.

---

* The events of the South: The great vinegrowers' strike, and the refusal of the soldiers of the 17th Infantry to shoot on the crowd at Narbonne in May, 1907.

And we think we can give you credit yet, because it was from your side that there came the profound words of Marx: "Proletarians have no Country," about which we did not think Bebel would come cavilling to-day; because it was one of you, Liebknecht, who at the Congress of Marseilles proclaimed that there are in the world but two Countries, that of the rich and that of the poor; because it is yourself, Bebel, who at our last Congress at Amsterdam demonstrated with force to Jaurès that all capitalist States, whatever be their governmental ticket, are class States, that they are almost alike, and you added that the French Republic was not so superior to a monarchy that you would have your head broken in for it.

Finally, we gave you credit because we could not believe that people who call out everywhere our beautiful motto of the International: "Proletarians of all Countries unite!" would go interpreting it in practice by "Proletarians of all Countries, massacre one another!" (Uproar.)

Well, now that we have gone forward trusting you, we put you two questions:

If to-morrow or the day after, the Moroccan affair cropped up again, and if you received an order for mobilisation in order to march against France—notice that when a war breaks out one never knows exactly who is the real aggressor—what will you do, German comrades?

Will you confine yourselves to again opposing to your emperor "the moral force" of your three million electors?

Will you not make an agreement with us so that on each side of the frontier, at the next order for mobilisation, we oppose to our rulers the general strike and insurrection?

Alas! after the words of Bebel, I am beginning to believe that we have had too much confidence in you and your Socialist and internationalist sentiments.

Oh! I know your qualities. I know your power of organisation, of which we have proofs even here at this Congress so admirably organised.

I know the peaceful and anti-warrior spirit of German workingmen; one can read it on their good, joyful, pacific faces—even too pacific.

And I know as well as anybody all the International owes your great theorists, from Karl Marx and Engels to Kautsky and Bernstein, a revisionist of the Right who has at least the courage of his Moderatism. I know, too, Bebel's glorious past, and the 18 months' imprisonment in a fortress he underwent in 1871 for protesting against the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.

But let me tell you frankly—you are living on your old reputation!

To-day, since you have allowed yourselves to be intoxicated by your electoral successes, since you are embourgeoisized in Parliament, you have become a party exclusively reformist and lawful; you have lost—if ever you had it—all revolutionary spirit, all revolutionary sense; you do not even understand what it is.

Shall I tell you all I am thinking of?

You are no more but an admirable machine for voting and paying subscriptions.

You are afraid of prison!

ROSA LUXEMBOURG: I protest.

HERVÉ: Are you Rosa Luxembourg?

You know very well I do not mean you who leave the Kaiser's prison only to enter that of the Czar. I only wish, comrade, there were many men like you in the German Social-Democracy.

Yes, you are afraid of prison. You were not afraid of it when, at the time of the Bismarckian persecution, you went in hundreds to defend your threatened electoral organisations. And now, when it is a question of stopping a war which would cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen and Germans, and which would dishonour Socialism and civilisation, there will

not be found amongst your three million electors, three hundred men to dare the gaols of your emperor!

You are a flock of sheep under the crook of your Kaiser Bebel—(protests, murmurs)—like our French Guesdists under the crook of their Pope, Jules Guesde. Your Kaiser Bebel, with his grey hair and the inability of all old men to understand novelties, thinks for you; you can say no more but "Amen!" Your discipline is a discipline of death.

When the war breaks out, go on! go on! under the colours of your emperor.

But you may depend upon it, if you march against France, you will be received with the shots of our insurrectional communes upon which you will see waving the red flag of our International, which you will have betrayed! (Angry groans and applause.)

Troclet (Belgium): We must steadily find out a practical solution of the questions of militarism to which all nations can agree, which all nations can execute practically without making the progress of the whole proletarian movement impossible.

Vaillant (France): Bebel has spoken against Hervé only without thoroughly examining the French motion. New circumstances, amongst others the experience of Russia, impose new modes of action upon us. For France and most other countries these are given. We do not admit the military revolt proposed by Hervé, which would constitute but a useless sacrifice; an action of the masses is alone efficient. The French resolution No. 1 recalls the resolutions of preceding International Congresses.

The speaker explained at length the importance of resolution No. 2. It had already made a start by the decisions of the International Socialist Bureau and the Interparliamentary Commission. The inconveniencies which might present themselves for the German comrades could be avoided by another form of wording.

Jaurès (France) continually interrupted by cheering, expressed his joy to be able to defend the French reso-

lution by the side of Vaillant who, at Amsterdam, was then in another camp. He rejected the Hervé motion on account of the form and the action it proposed. Bebel, like Hervé, exaggerated the importance of Hervéism, which was decaying. But the events of Fashoda and Morocco porpounded a new problem. Capitalism carried war in its womb: the proletariat could make it miscarry. We ought to apply our already formidable force to all social manifestations of capitalist oppression. We would be dishonoured if we did not do our utmost to avoid war, not only in case of an intervention in Russia, but also in case of a Franco-German conflict. The most prudent, as also the noblest, was to perform our duty fearlessly. Henceforth, let us take governments at their word, by insisting for arbitration. In case of international conflict we should not allow it to be said that the action of the international, whose power is affirming itself in this Congress, is failing.

Vollmar (Germany) affirmed, in face of the anti-patriotic declarations of Hervé, the patriotism of the proletariat. The propaganda he was asking for was dangerous; it was we who could judge it. It was sufficient to recall the resolutions of Paris and Zurich: the French motion was unacceptable for us. Do not try to bind us by this resolution to means of action which we reject.

Vandervelde (Belgium) protested against Vollmar's suggestion to the French to exclude Hervé. (Cheers, and a protest from Vollmar.) Hervé had done great service. As for Guesde's objection, anti-militarism was as little a deviation as the co-operative and teetotal questions. He was for the French motion. We must have the certainty that we were all at one to do our duty. The Germans should think it over in order to avoid a painful want of unanimity. We could not be satisfied with an empty formula which would make us a spectacle of weakness and of pusillanimity.

Adler (Austria), generally speaking, agreed with Vandervelde. He showed the dialectic development of

militarism, of which the Russian Revolution, after the war, had provided an example. When the Germans told us that the French motion might harm them we must give in. We could not bind ourselves positively, and still less negatively. Above all, it had to be expressed that, in spite of the difference of the means available by circumstances, in case of a threatened war, all the forces of the proletariat must be concentrated against it.

Rosa Luxembourg (Poland) insisted upon the lessons of the Russian Revolution. We should not try to crystallise our method in a sort of pseudo-Marxian fatalism. The Bebel motion must be accentuated; it was no use enumerating some means of action, but still less use excluding any of them.

Russel Smart (England, I.L.P.) said the Hervé resolution did not at all suit England. No English Government was capable of making war without the consent of the overwhelming majority of the working class. But if the public were so nationalistically poisoned, a military strike would be pure madness. Thus English Socialism, in its struggle against war, could under no circumstances go any further than friendly action in Parliament and enlightening agitation in meetings and in the street. The English section, however, grasped Hervé's proposals, but it could not attribute any practical meaning to them for itself. They would, in case they were in a minority, simply act as they did during the Transvaal war, without undertaking anything violent and making fools of themselves.

But also the French and German resolutions in the form in which they were drafted were unacceptable to us, because they called for the general armament of the people. The general armament of the people may be a step forward, provided the people are already militarised; with us it would be a step backward. Just now our bourgeoisie, which was cleverer than all others, had unfolded to our workmen an agitation for conscription, which we strenuously opposed, for even the English soldiery did not shoot on the people. This was

shown clearly at the docker's strike at Belfast, where there were three killed during the troubles, but two of them were not on the side of the strikers. This showed that in England the soldiers did not shoot on the people, but into the air. Therefore, we did not want the general armament of the people. Moreover, English liberty allowed us to agitate most freely and most safely against militarism. Consequently, we must, in the interest of England, amend the resolutions by an amendment against the general armament of the people.

Bebel (Germany) said he did not exaggerate the importance of Hervêism, and answered Hervé's attacks. There had never been a question of a German intervention in Russia. In time of war, there would be a general catastrophic situation making strike superfluous. The most important was the preparatory organisation and agitation.

Bebel now proposed to elect a Sub-Commission with the object of drafting a resolution acceptable to all; this was agreed to, and the following elected:—

France.—Jaurès, Guesde.
Great Britain.—Scheu, Russel Smart.
Germany.—Bebel, Vollmar.
Italy.—Ferri, Costa.
Austria.—Adler, Skatula.
Poland.—Biscremin, Rosa Luxembourg.
Belgium.—Vandervelde.
Scandinavia.—Branting.
Switzerland.—Sigg.

Whereupon the general debate continued:—

Frank Weiss (Italy) wanted to defend Hervéism, which in Italy had won a tremendous following and numerous martyrs. Hervé and Jaurès had nothing in

common. Hervé wanted to break the sword of the bourgeoisie, whereas Jaurès wanted to prevent it from being drawn from the sheath. Hervé's anti-militarism was no Utopia, this was proved by the behaviour of the 17th Regiment, and the refusal of Italian soldiers to intervene in wage struggles; it was also proved by the prosecution of anti-militarists by the Justice of the ruling classes. Also, the Russian Revolutionaries and the Moscow barricade fighters were anti-militarists in the sense of Hervé, for they carried the agitation into the barracks. Consequently, Bebel had not over-estimated the meaning of Hervéism, which was independent of Hervé's person. Truly, anti-militarist agitation in Germany was very difficult in view of the threatening formidable penal servitude. But the German Social-Democrats might at least accept the Vaillant resolution. He had got to take home to his Italian comrades the promise of the German Social-Democrats that they would not deliver the neighbouring Countries to Prussian militarism.

Andreas Scheu (England, S.D.F.), Costa (Italy), Carr (America), Roubanowitch (Russia) also spoke, and the labours of the First Commission came to an end.

The proceedings of the Sub-Commission were private, and brought forward the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously by the First Commission, who selected Emile Vandervelde to report to the Congress.

MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS.*

The Congress confirms the resolutions passed by the former International Congresses against militarism and imperialism, and it again declares that the fight against

* The following translation of the resolution is that which was laid before the Congressists by the International Socialist Bureau.

militarism cannot be separated from the Socialist struggle of classes as a whole.

Wars between capitalistic States are, as a rule, the consequence of their competition in the world's market, for every State is eager not only to preserve its markets, but also to conquer new ones, principally by the subjugation of foreign nations and the confiscation of their lands. These wars are further engendered by the unceasing and ever-increasing armaments of militarism, which is one of the principal instruments for maintaining the predominance of the bourgeois classes, and for subjugating the working classes politically as well as economically.

The breaking out of wars is further favoured by the national prejudices systematically cultivated in the interest of the reigning classes, in order to turn off the masses of the proletariat from the duties of their class and of international solidarity.

Wars are, therefore, essential to capitalism; they will not cease until the capitalistic system has been done away with, or until the sacrifices in men and money required by the technical development of the military system and the revolt against the armaments have become so great as to compel the nations to give up this system.

Especially the working classes, from which the soldiers are chiefly recruited, and which have to bear the greater part of the financial burdens, are by nature opposed to war, because it is irreconcilable with their aim: the creation of a new economic system founded on a Socialistic basis, and realising the solidarity of the nations.

The Congress, therefore. considers it to be the duty of the working classes, and especially of their parliamentary representatives, to fight with all their might against the military and naval armaments, not to grant any money for such purposes, pointing out at the same time the class character of bourgeois society and the real motives for keeping up the antagonisms between nations, and further to imbue the young people of the

working classes with the Socialistic spirit of universal brotherhood, and with class consciousness.

The Congress considers that the democratic organisation of national defence, by replacing the standing army by the armed people, will prove an effective means for making aggressive wars impossible, and for overcoming national antagonisms.

The International cannot lay down rigid formulæ for the action of the working classes against militarism, as this action must of necessity differ according to the time and the conditions of the various national paties. But it is its duty to intensify and to co-ordinate as much as possible the efforts of the working classes against militarism and against war.

In fact, since the Brussels Congress, the proletariat, in its untiring fight against militarism, by refusing to grant the expenses for military and naval armaments, by democratising the army, has had recourse with increasing vigour and success to the most varied methods of action in order to prevent the breaking out of wars, or to end them, or to make use of the agitation of the social body caused by a war for the emancipation of the working classes, as for instance the understanding arrived at between the English and the French trade unions after the Fashoda crisis, which served to assure peace and to re-establish friendly relations between England and France; the action of the Socialist parties in the German and French Parliaments during the Morocco crisis; the public demonstrations organised for the same purpose by the French and German Socialists; the common action of the Austrian and Italian Socialists who met at Trieste in order to ward off a conflict between the two States; further, the vigorous intervention of the Socialist workers of Sweden in order to prevent an attack against Norway; and, lastly, the heroic sacrifices and fights of the masses of Socialist workers and peasants of Russia and Poland rising against the war provoked by the Government of the Czar, in order to put an end to it, and to make use of the crisis for the emancipation of their country, and of

the working classes. All these efforts show the growing power of the proletariat and its increasing desire to maintain peace by its energetic intervention.

The action of the working classes will be the more successful, the more the mind of the people has been prepared by an unceasing propaganda, and the more the Labour parties of the different countries have been stimulated and drawn together by the International.

The Congress further expresses its conviction that under the pressure exerted by the proletariat the practice of honest arbitration in all disputes will take the place of the futile attempts of the bourgeois governments, and that in this way the people will be assured the benefit of universal disarmament which will allow the enormous resources of energy and money wasted, by armaments and by wars, to be applied to the progress of civilisation.

In case of war being imminent, the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries concerned shall be bound, with the assistance of the International Socialist Bureau, to do all they can to prevent the breaking out of the war, using for this purpose the means which appear to them the most efficacious, and which must naturally vary according to the acuteness of the struggle of classes, and to the general political conditions.

In case war should break out notwithstanding, they shall be bound to intervene for its being brought to a speedy end, and to employ all their forces for utilising the economical and political crisis created by the war, in order to rouse the masses of the people, and to hasten the downbreak of the predominance of the capitalist class.

Emile Vandervelde (Belgium) said it was easier for the working class than any other class to unite internationally, for their interests were internationally more identical than those of any other class. Yet they must recognise that there was a right of legitimate defence against illegitimate attack. Referring to the Swiss system, he contended that it had this objection, that it

was officered by the bourgeois, whereas they must demand the election of such officers. The Commission did not wish the resolution to apply in detail to those happy peoples who had not a conscript army. He urged that there were grave objections to a general strike or insurrection because of a war; and, in reference to the criticisms of the German Party in this connection, he pointed out that, outside of Russia, the Party of no Country had suffered so much prosecution as had been endured by their German comrades.

The closure upon the discussion was carried by acclamation, but there arose a loud demand for Hervé to speak. The President finally decided to permit Hervé to speak on the closure, but not on the report of the Commission.

Gustave Hervé said the elegant form in which the closure was proposed did honour to the skill of the Sub-Commission, which he had never doubted. But it was a gross blunder. Did they think that the world did not know of the discord between the resolution proposed by the Commission and the speeches made by the German delegates? The difference was so great that he (Hervé), who was certainly not a tactician nor a diplomatist—(laughter)—would vote for it with both hands, and he hoped Bebel and Vollmar would do the same; but their speeches in the Commission had been almost contrary of the resolution. Therefore, he could not admit the closure without an explanation from the German delegation in which they would explain the contradiction. Vandervelde had even accentuated the resolution through his report, but he was a Frenchman from Belgium—(laughter)—and his utterances had not the value which an explanation of the responsible representatives of German Social-Democracy would have on this platform. Until the German delegation had explained that they no longer agreed to Bebel's and Vollmar's point of view, but stood wholly for the resolution, he could not assent to its

adoption by acclamation. But he also had another reason for wishing for a debate : At this moment they fully enjoyed free speech in Germany. (Laughter.) At the most they only risked being expelled from Germany like Quelch, and that was no punishment. (Renewed laughter.) Or they would bring the government to the ridiculous situation of breaking up the Congress, which had already terminated its labours. Consequently, let us discuss and compel the German Social-Democracy to recognise colours, and to declare itself fully and wholly in the sense of the resolution.

The debate was closed and the resolution adopted.*

---

* A complete verbatim report, with notes and comments, and photos of the principal speakers on the military question at Stuttgart will appear shortly in pamphlet form.

Printed by the Twentieth Century Press, Ltd., 37A, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

HX
545
H57813

Herve, Gustave
My country right or wrong

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 11 03 06 08 009 6